The ARYAN PATH

Vol. VII. FEBRUARY 1936 No. 2.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE SHOP-KEEPER: A SERMON OF THE BUDDHA	57
THE SONG OF THE HIGHER LIFE:	
V. THE YOGA OF PARTIAL KNOWLEDGE—*By Sri Krishna Prem* ...	58
THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER:	
I. A MATERIALIST VISIONS THE FUTURE—*By Quincy Howe* ...	65
II. AS AN IDEALIST VIEWS IT—*By Radhakamal Mukerjee*	69
GOD'S RESPONSIBILITY AND MAN'S FREEDOM—*By C. E. M. Joad*	74
A NOTE ON THE ABOVE	78
THE WORLD IS ONE: WESTERN RELIGION AND INTERNATIONALISM—*By J. D. Beresford*	82
WHEAT—*By Dr. Irene B. Hudson*	87
NEW BOOKS AND OLD—	
THE MEANING OF "PROMETHEUS UNBOUND"—*By D. S. Sarma* ...	91
REVIEWS—*By M. James, N. K. K., R. A. V. M., S. B., H. P. A. F., Geoffrey West*	94
CORRESPONDENCE:	
P. NAGA RAJA RAO ON KANT—*By Philip Chapin Jones*	100
ENDS AND SAYINGS	102

51, ESPLANADE ROAD - - BOMBAY, INDIA

THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India

CONTRIBUTIONS:—Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten, on one side of the paper only, with wide margin, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles only. They are not necessarily in agreement with the views of their contributors, to whom they leave free expression of opinion.

CORRESPONDENCE:—Letters from subscribers and readers are welcome, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the Magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of THE ARYAN PATH.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:—THE ARYAN PATH is published monthly. No subscriptions are accepted for less than six months, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single and back numbers, and back volumes, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance to the Manager, THE ARYAN PATH. Price: In India, single copy As. 12; per annum Rs. 6. In Europe, single copy 1*s.* 6*d.*; per annum 12*s.* or equivalent. In America single copy 35 cents; per annum $3; all post free.

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

THIS monthly publication of 16 pages blends the past and the present by reprinting old articles from H. P. B.'s *Theosophist* and *Lucifer*, and W. Q. Judge's *Path*, as well as throwing the light of Theosophy on modern events. All articles are of practical interest.

Principal Contents for January 1936

Some Views of an Asiatic
Wanted: The Religion of Knowledge
"Lucifer" to the Archbishop of Canterbury
Studies in the Secret Doctrine: Ideal and the Way to It
Masters Need Companions
Theosophy and Pseudo-Theosophy: A Criticism and a Confession
Arjuna in the Three Halls

Price: As. 2. Annual Subscription: Re. 1, 2*s.*, or 50 cents, post free.

AUM

Point out the "Way"—however dimly,
and lost among the host—as does the evening
star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. VII FEBRUARY 1936 No. 2

THE SHOPKEEPER

A SERMON OF THE BUDDHA

"Monks, possessed of three characteristics the shopkeeper is capable of acquiring wealth he had not before, of holding what he gets, of increasing what he holds. What three?

"Herein, monks, the shopkeeper at early dawn attends closely to his work, and again at midday, and again at eventide.

"Just so, monks possessed of three characteristics a monk is capable of acquiring a state of profit, of holding it when gotten or increasing a state of profit when he gets it. At early dawn the monk concentrates on the mark of his meditation exercise, and again at midday and again at eventide.

"Monks, possessed of three characteristics a shopkeeper in no long time attains greatness and increase in wealth. What three?

"Herein, monks, a shopkeeper is shrewd, supremely capable and inspires confidence.

"The shopkeeper knows of his goods: This article, bought for so much and sold for so much, will bring in so much money, such and such profit. That is how he is shrewd.

"The shopkeeper is clever at buying and selling goods. That is how he is supremely capable.

"The shopkeeper becomes known to housefathers or housefathers' sons, or to opulent men. They make offers of wealth to him, saying: 'Master shopkeeper, take this money and trade with it; support your sons and wife, and pay us back from time to time.' That, monks, is how a shopkeeper inspires confidence.

"In like manner, monks, possessed of these three characteristics a monk in no long time attains greatness and increase in profitable states."

THE SONG OF THE HIGHER LIFE

V.—THE YOGA OF PARTIAL KNOWLEDGE*

[Below we publish the fifth of a series of essays founded on the great text-book of Practical Occultism, the *Bhagavad-Gita*. Each of these will discuss a title of one of the eighteen chapters of the Song Celestial. The writer calls them " Notes on the Chapter Titles of the Gita "—but they are more than notes. They bring a practical message born of study and experience.

This particular study is on the fourth chapter, entitled, Jñāna Vibhāga Yoga.

Sri Krishna Prem is the name taken in the old traditional manner prevailing in India by a young English gentleman when he resolved to enter the Path of Vairagya, renouncing his all, including the name given to him at birth. He took his tripos at Cambridge in Mental and Moral Sciences and is a deep student of Indian philosophy. Away from the world but serving it with faith he lives in the Himalayas, and is esteemed highly for his sincerity, earnestness and devotion.—EDS.]

The same imperishable Yoga that I taught to Vivaswān long ages ago I am again setting forth for thee to-day.

Thus opens the fourth chapter and, in so saying, Sri Krishna reveals the source and credentials of the teaching He has to impart. It is no " new " doctrine, the private property of a particular teacher, that is being set forth; nothing, either, that is intended to form a new sect, shut off by the fortress walls of dogma from the life all around, walls which will have to be broken with infinite pain before the imprisoned souls can escape.

It has to be clearly understood that there is no ownership in the realm of ideas. Ideas are not the property of individual thinkers. Rather is it the fact, as Plato rightly taught, that when we entertain a " new " idea we do but participate in something that is eternal and that when two men " think " of the same idea they are united with each other by this very fact since both are participating in a particular facet of the Eternal Wisdom. Ideas are greater than any of the finite minds that think them and the Wisdom is greater than any particular teacher. Therefore it was that the Buddha made no claim to originality, being content to say that what He taught was but the echo of the teaching of all the former Buddhas, and therefore it is that Sri Krishna is careful to explain that the Yoga He is teaching to Arjuna is but a restatement of the Eternal Wisdom for, assuredly, it was not as the personal Krishna that " he " taught it first to Vivaswān long ages before.

Let none suppose, however, that by the phrase " Eternal Wisdom " is here meant some body of teachings set down in intellectual form in any books however old. The Wisdom is the wordless Truth itself as existing eternally in the Cosmic Ideation. It is the Norm

* This chapter, a more literal translation of the title of which would be " The Yoga of the Section of Knowledge " as distinguished from the full knowledge of Chapter 7, deals with knowledge as applied to sacrificial action.

by which all teachings must be judged, the Fount from which all great religions and philosophies have sprung, and, being beyond the level of individuality, It is utterly impersonal. It is *The Truth.* Fortunate is that man through whose mind even a ray of that Wisdom Light can manifest for, though he still may make frequent mistakes, yet he has in his hands an Ariadne thread with which, if he will but follow it up, he can make his way safely through the labyrinth of theories and avoid the quicksands of doubt. It is this Wisdom which inspired the ancient Sages and the divine Kings of whom the records of all the archaic peoples tell and it is this Wisdom, or rather Its manifestation, that has "decayed here on earth through great efflux of time" as the warring schools sought each to imprison in its own system the gleaming splendour that shone in the words of its Founder. Vain their efforts as of one who would seek to grasp the spirit of life by hermetically sealing up some living being !

Jñāna yoga, karma yoga, bhakti yoga, dhyāna yoga, all are but one-sided glimpses, fragments of that mighty whole, the "imperishable Yoga," the imparting of which in its all-sided beauty is the aim of Sri Krishna.

Sri Krishna, in fact, *is* that Wisdom. Certainly He was also a living Teacher, one of those great Beings who, from time to time, incarnate on earth for the welfare of suffering humanity ; but the "I" who taught Vivaswān, the "Me" to Whom, throughout the *Gita,* attention is to be directed, is no mere historic figure however great or splendid. It is the Divine Wisdom that is speaking, the *Mahān Ātman* of the *Kathopanishad,* that which Plato referred to as the World of Ideas and which has here been termed the Cosmic Ideation.

It is the birth of this Wisdom in the human soul that is celebrated each year at the *Janmāshtmi* festival, the Wisdom that destroys the demons of ignorance and selfishness, the Wisdom whose other names are Love and Sacrifice. Though Unborn and Undying yet does this Wisdom-Love manifest in human souls from time to time and especially at times of great spiritual stress when materialism and the cosmic forces of disharmony are straining at the personalities of men and forcing them away from their contact with the Inner Watcher. At such times a terrific tension is set up in the inner worlds, a tension which manifests itself in a psychic unrest in the heart of man and also among the peoples of the earth, tossing them hither and thither in wars and revolutions like corks upon a sea of sorrow.

Then like the lightning flash cleaving the night, comes at the dark midnight hour, the great Mystery, the birth of the Birthless, the action of the Actionless, and once again, the Light of the World is revealed to them that walk in darkness. Therefore does Sri Krishna say that they who know the *essential nature* of His Divine birth and actions wander no more in the cycles of suffering but attain to His exalted Being.

But not only at certain seasons in the outer world must that Birth take place. It is not enough to look with longing backward-turned eyes at the Light which once blazed with such splendour in Muttra, at Buddha-Gaya or in Nazareth. In the dark soul of every disciple must the Divine Krishna be born and, throughout the ages, many are those who, filled with the new-born Wisdom, the Slayer of the demons of passion, fear and anger, have passed along by the ancient narrow Path (the *anuḥ panthā puranaḥ* of the Upanishads) and, piercing through the Darkness, have entered His Being.

"In all ways* men follow My Path" says Krishna and, indeed there is no other Path, *nānyaḥ panthā vidyate' yanāya.* The only bridge that spans the sea of sorrow is the Bridge of Light, the many-coloured rainbow bridge, and though one may give what names one pleases to the various stages, and may use primarily intellect, emotion or unselfish action as the stick by the help of which one essays the crossing, yet is it the same Path for all, the Ladder of Souls figured on many an Egyptian papyrus† and known to all the ancient teachers of the world, the ladder whose foot rests in the deep mire of the disciple's sins and failings but whose summit is lost in the glorious Light of Nirvāna. Truly did Hermes Trismegistus say of it, "If thou but settest foot on this Path, thou shalt see it everywhere both when and where thou dost expect it not."

But no mere theoretical knowledge of this Path will enable the disciple to tread it. It can only be trodden by *becoming* oneself its various stages. "In this Path, to whatever place one goes, that place one's own self becomes."‡ The consciousness must be raised step by step and it is useless to think as did certain *Sānkhyas* that if only action could be abandoned the soul would fly up at once like a bird released from a cage. Useless, because, even if the more obvious outer actions be forcibly abandoned the subtle actions of the mind will remain to bind the soul as firmly as ever.

The only way to tread the Path in reality is by the knowledge of Krishna, of the *Átman* which is present as the unseen background of every action, of the smallest as of the greatest, of the action that sends the pen across this page as of the action that hurls a million men into battle. Just as nothing can move except within the framework of space, so nothing can take place except within the Light of the *Átman*, which yet is no more entangled in the actions than space is entangled in the movements of objects, and therefore Krishna says that those who know Him are freed from the bonds of action.

Such men are wise for they see inaction in action and action in inaction. They see, that is, that while

* "From all sides" is another translation but both Shankara and Sridhara paraphrase 'sarvashah" as "sarvaprakaiaih."

† *e. g. Book of the Dead*, Chapter 98 (Theban Recension).

‡ *Jñāneshwari*, 6-160.

in the midst of all movements broods the motionless *Átman*, yet do all actions spring from that *Átman* or, rather, take place *within* that calm and passionless Light. This is the knowledge whose fire burns up all actions, slaying desire for selfish fruits and making the man a Sage who, though his body and mind are forever engaged in action, yet does nothing since he clings to naught.

Of one with attachment dead, liberated from bondage, with his thoughts established in knowledge, his works sacrifices, all action melts away.

For certainly the instinct which leads so many to reject the idea of an actionless life in spite of all arguments is a sound one. To reject action is to create a dualism between the *Brahman* and the universe which leaves the latter on our hands as a vast cosmic folly, worse than folly, a monstrous cruelty that stinks to the heavens. But it is not so. There is no ultimate dualism in the Reality. It is not action that binds, for the surging tides of the manifested Cosmos are as truly the manifestation of the supreme *Brahman* as is the calm bliss of the stainless witnessing Self. What binds us is a wrong attitude to action, the "knots of the heart" which, springing from ignorance, make us fancy that we are so many separate individuals, isolated from each other and "free" to perform actions for our selfish ends. This, and not action in itself, is what binds us and therefore it is that Krishna returns again and again to the theme of unattachment to the fruits of action for there is no freedom for the selfish actor any more than for a bird that is in the meshes of a net.

Let it, however, once become clear that the manifestation is also an aspect of the Supreme *Brahman* and it will be evident that there must be a way of action which does not bind the Soul. And this is the realization that now begins to dawn in the heart of the disciple. He sees, though as yet but with his mind, for there is still a long and weary road to be traversed before the vision will permeate his whole being, that the action, the actor and the act are all so many manifestations of the stainless Eternal and that if all action be but offered as a sacrifice in the consuming fire of that *Brahman*, there can be no bondage; for the root cause of the bondage, the ignorance which makes a dualism and a multiplicity where there is in truth but One, is now removed and, if not yet eradicated entirely, is at least seen for what it is, an unreal phantom like the snake which is seen where in reality is but a rope.

This knowledge has now to be applied if it is to be made effective and so the Teacher proceeds to enumerate various types of practice by which the knowledge may be made to pervade the whole life of the disciple. Some will practise restraint of the senses as a prelude to that more advanced stage in which the now controlled senses can be used for the service of the *Átman* which is in all. Others endeavour to serve with their wealth or learning or with that concentrated force of character which is

the result of self-discipline (*tapasya*). Others again devote themselves to yogic practices with a view to gaining that inner poise which will enable them to keep their balance in the whirlpool of activity and hold out helping hands to others in due season.

All these strive to sacrifice themselves in various ways to the *Átman* who is in all and all these sacrifices culminate in the wisdom sacrifice, the effort to gain the life-giving wisdom* not, again, in order that oneself may be wise but because in wisdom lies salvation for all.

All action and all efforts find their completion in the gaining of that Wisdom but, just as life springs only from other lives, so the flame of wisdom can only be lit by contact with those in whose heart it already shines. The disciple must resort to the feet of a wise teacher, one who is an embodiment of that Teacher who is already in his heart, the Eternal Wisdom referred to before. Some will wonder why, if the Teacher is already present in the heart, there should be need for an external Guru at all. True, the Teacher is there but we are so used to listening only to the trumpet tones of desire that the still small voice in the heart passes unheeded. Too often does the disciple mistake the promptings of desire and of unpurified emotion for the intuition which is the Voice of the Teacher and therefore is it that he needs the guidance of one who, because his whole being has become one with Wisdom, can speak with the same voice as that Teacher in the heart and yet do so in tones which can be heard with the outer ear.

Such Gurus are always to be found at the right time, for the earth is never without men who know the Truth, men who, however scattered and unlinked with each other they may appear, yet constitute a Race apart, a Race whose Light shineth in darkness though the darkness comprehendeth it not, a Race which never dies, for it is constantly renewed throughout the ages as the torch of Wisdom passes from hand to hand.

But it is not by wandering restlessly hither and thither, by searching out the remoter corners of the earth, that the Guru can be found. The Path which leads to the feet of the Guru, outer as well as inner, is an *interior* path and, only by treading the preliminary steps by oneself, can one reach the outer Guide. It is only when this stage has been reached, the stage at which the disciple is ready to offer up his self in sacrifice to the Self in all that the Guru can and does manifest himself; "when the disciple is ready the Guru appears."† For him whose aims are selfish, however "refined" the selfishness may be, no teacher will be forthcoming. To such an one a Guru could be of little use since his work is but to make more manifest the Voice in the heart and until the

* See Chapter 18, Verse 70, for explanation of the *jñāna yajna*.

† Popular superstition has it that no Guru can give *Diksha* (initiation) unless he is given *Dakshinā* (a fee). Corrupt as all such practices are, this is a symbol of a profound truth. Of all who seek a Guru the question is asked: "What do you offer and what will you give in return for the Wisdom that you seek?"

disciple has learnt to listen always for that inner Voice, a blind obedience to an external authority can do more harm than good, destroying self-reliance and so rendering fainter that which is too faint already.

When, however, the right stage of development has been reached and the disciple has found his Guru, he must by the obeisance of self-effacement and the service which consists in putting the will at the disposal of the Teacher, so unite his being with that of the latter that the Wisdom which shines in him may be lighted up in the disciple too.

Then will the disciple begin to *see* that all beings are within the Light of the One Self just as all things exist within the matrix of space and, by the raft of this Wisdom Light, he will commence to cross over to the Further Shore. For just as fire reduces fuel to ashes, so does the Wisdom Light destroy all sense of difference and multiplicity.* The actions which fatally bound the self are powerless to affect the Self for action binds through ignorance and the Self is free through Wisdom.

But though the Wisdom will save him who lays hold of it from bondage to his past sins, none should think that there is any room here for antinomianism for none can serve God and Mammon and he who is guilty of that egoistic self-assertion which is the essence of all "sin" is by that very fact far removed from the Wisdom the heart of which is sacrifice of self.

True, the Wisdom is hidden in the hearts of all, "even of the most sinful," but it is only he who is "perfected in Yoga," in sacrificial action, that finds It there in due season. For this the disciple needs faith (*shraddhā*),† not the blind belief of the sectarian creedsmen, but the firm aspiration of the soul which seeks to give itself, an aspiration which is lit by a faintly luminous glow that is itself a reflection of the Wisdom that it preludes. Not only must he have this faith. He must also have gained the mastery over his senses else will they carry him away "as the wind hurries away a ship upon the waters" and the sails of aspiration that were set for the voyage to the Deathless will but bear the Soul more swiftly to the black rocks of death.

Above all must the disciple beware of doubt that creeps in like a dark fog over the sea blotting out the guiding stars and filling the soul with despair. From time to time as he tries to advance will this fog of doubt enwrap his heart. The Light by which he has hitherto been guided will fade and be eclipsed and all that he has accomplished will seem vain and a delusion. Then must he show of what material he is made, for if he wavers and loses heart he is lost indeed. Clinging to the compass of the Wisdom, an intellectual memory of which is all

* Christians who are not too fettered by superstition may see here the meaning of the salvation of sinners by faith in the crucifixion of Christ. The blood of Christ is the Wisdom Light which is shed through the sacrifice of self for the sake of all. That Light, if clung to, has power by its very nature to save "even the most sinful of sinners."

† The nature of "faith" will be further discussed in connection with Chapter 17.

that remains to him in this condition, he must press on in confidence that the fog will lift in time and the familiar stars shine forth once more. For, in the end, it is only the Wisdom which can silence doubt. As long as there is any clinging to a separate self, so long is there fear for that self since all that is separate must one day cease to be. Only the Wisdom which knows the Self as One in all can silence the whisperings of fear and cleave the fog of doubt. Only he shall live who feareth not to die, and such fearlessness can be his alone who, by the *buddhi yoga*, has united himself to the Light, and, by the *karma yoga*, has offered up the self in sacrifice to Self. He alone will stand rocklike in the Self when selves are scattered like leaves by the burning winds of sorrow.

Therefore with the sword of the knowledge of the One Self cleaving asunder the ignorance born doubt dwelling in thy heart, be established in *Yoga* and stand up, O Arjuna.

SRI KRISHNA PREM

"Krishna Himself is the actor; Arjuna and Duryodhana are also actors; so are the blind Dhritarashtra and the observant Sanjaya. Each acts his part but the knowledge which the Song of the Lord imparts is the knowledge about the Spirit of Man manifesting its glory and grace in *Samsara*, and its baffling puzzlement. The two chief characters are Arjuna and Krishna.

These two figures are symbols—one of the end and the summation of human evolution, Man become God; the second is the symbol of Man seeking wisdom which would make him God. God each one of us is at heart and in latency, but to show forth that Divinity we must first know the Purusha by the effort of mind and intellect and then act our part in daily life in terms of that Wisdom. Sankhya, Buddhi-Yoga, and Avatara, are the three words of the *Gita* which need to be studied and understood and popularized in modern India."

THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER

[We here set over against each other the Materialist and the Idealist reaction to the social order now in its birth throes. **Quincy Howe** is one of the clearest-seeing journalists in America; **Dr. Radhakamal Mukerjee** heads the Department of Economics and Sociology in the University of Lucknow.

Humanity *en masse* may be, as Mr. Howe contends, the sorry puppet of lust and fear, and we might add of other obsessions. But one example of a Man like Gautama, the Buddha, who, beyond the touch of personal like or dislike, pleasure or pain, gave His long life in willing sacrifice, shows fear and lust as chains we shall cast off at last, for what man has done, other men can do—EDS.]

I.—A MATERIALIST VISIONS THE FUTURE

In asking me to write an article "giving your personal philosophy, that is, your own ideas which you would propagate to mould the course of history by influencing its makers," the editors of THE ARYAN PATH suggested a distinction which is fundamental to my theme. For in attempting to comply with their request, I found at once that my "personal philosophy" and the "ideas" which I should "propagate" were complementary rather than identical.

My personal philosophy is purely materialistic. I belong to that vast category classed as Aristoteleans as contrasted with that equally vast category designated as Platonists. To me the world is what I perceive through my senses. Mind and life are merely two forms of matter. But just as inanimate matter can never become conscious of itself, so animate matter can never comprehend its own nature. Lenin once defined cognition as the highest function of matter; I should hesitate even to qualify it. Needless to say, however, this belief of mine, like the Nicene Creed, is a matter of faith pure and simple. It cannot be proved, even in the sense that the multiplication table can. Being the product of a limited human experience it is also subject to change without notice.

On this materialist hypothesis I erect a structure of further hypotheses, equal y arbitrary. I believe that all forms of life—including man—are governed by two forces, lust and fear, and that these forces can be calculated almost all the time. Now perhaps that word "almost" is the spiritual nigger in my materialist wood-pile, for my slight knowledge of history and scant experience with human beings have taught me that man is a creature of change. Many forms of life have, of course, remained unchanged as far as the records of the rocks show. The earliest fossils consist of fishes and crustaceans identical with those that exist to-day. Other forms of life, however, have vanished—the mastodon, the mammoth, and the great reptiles—and still others have changed—notably the horse.

Although I am not at all convinced that man evolved from the ape, I am convinced that human beings with identical physical features have undergone changes of another character because of the different methods by which they have supplied themselves with food and shelter. Furthermore, Spengler's contention that the great changes in human history have occurred suddenly seems to me not wholly absurd. I do not share his belief that the hand emerged suddenly, but I am convinced that the development of power-driven machinery during the past two hundred years represents as far-reaching and rapid a change as any that Spengler has recorded.

It is because our means of production are now undergoing the most rapid transformation in recorded history that I qualify my statement about lust and fear as the two basic constants in human history. The very bewilderments that our changing environment brings forth cause both fear and lust to assume different and even contradictory forms. A drowning man clutches at straws; a panic-stricken American may buy gold, real estate, utility stocks or spend his last dime on gin.

True, fear and lust are the mainsprings of behaviour as they were a thousand years ago ; but in a static society like medieval Europe, the social behaviour of human beings can be and has been reduced to a science (*viz.*, Machiavelli). And speaking of Machiavelli I agree entirely with all his so-called "cynical" strictures concerning the race of men though I do not share his idealistic concept of the ruler, who is, after all, as lustful and fearful an animal as any of his subjects. Nor does Machiavelli make sufficient allowance for the factor of change, a deficiency wholly due to the time in which he lived.

In defining my personal philosophy, then, I should say that human history is the product of two forces, lust and fear, and that human beings pass their entire lives in the grip of both emotions. At certain periods, however, rapidly changing conditions of life such as obtained in the France of 1789, the Russia of 1917, or the United States of 1935 cause these two basic forces to work in many and unexpected directions. Such periods in history, are generally referred to as "revolutionary."

That we are living in such a period to-day is a point that hardly needs to be emphasized. It seems to me equally clear that Karl Marx was the prophet of this revolution just as Jesus was the prophet of the revolution that destroyed, much more gradually, the Roman Empire, and the far more static economy of that time. For me to sum up here the teachings of Marx would be a waste of time: many more competent writers have covered the subject completely. All that I shall attempt is to indicate, with a bow in the general direction of Karl Marx, the particular struggle that is going forward to-day.

On the one hand we have an increasing concentration of wealth in the hands of an unproductive minority, and on the other, as its necessary complement, increasing insecurity for an ever-growing mass of productive workers. Precisely such a con-

dition preceded the French Revolution, which was not a revolt of the majority from misery, but a vertical split in which such aristocrats as Mirabeau and Lafayette sided with the Revolution while poor folk, notably in the Gironde, supported the Monarchy. To-day a more rapidly increasing capacity to produce wealth is creating a deeper cleavage. But it is precisely the rapidity of the change, coupled with the lethargy of the human animal and the survival of the influences of a different environment, that have prevented a sudden collapse. Also we have to-day the world-wide system of imperialism that maintains the *status quo* in such nations as Austria, Germany, and Italy, all of which have been saved from revolution by foreign loans.

Whether this is sound Marxist doctrine, I do not know. But one thing I do know and that is that Marx's classless society has exactly as much chance of coming true as Jesus's kingdom of heaven on earth or as the promised land of Moses. Yet those three men had more influence on the Occident, if not on the whole world, than any other figures in history, and Bernard Shaw was a thousand times right when he recently described Marx as the latest of the great Hebrew prophets. In spite of my materialism, I cannot deny that men seldom if ever admit the real sources of their behaviour and are forever making a virtue of necessity. But the idealist emphasizes this necessity for moral justification more heavily; to me it seems merely the outgrowth of communal life. I admire, as much as any idealist, the courage and unselfishness of such a life as Marx's, indeed the very absurdity of his classless society ideal makes his career all the more admirable. What makes it important, though, is something else again: the fact that his preposterous Utopian visions inspired him to undertake a revolutionary analysis of capitalist society.

Now I do not suppose for one moment that the world would be better, worse, or in any way altered if all the statesmen in every country shared these views or any other set of views under the sun. Whether their heads are full of Marx or mush, Stanley Baldwin will support the interest of one class in one country, Roosevelt of the same class in another country, Stalin of another class in many countries. And if one of their henchmen breaks ranks he will suffer the fate of Trotzky, Sir John Simon and Upton Sinclair and be cast into outer darkness.

Perhaps I can clarify these ideas by applying them more closely to the world we live in. Just as the uprisings that led to the deaths of Charles I in England and Louis XVI in France marked the collapse of the feudal aristocracy in Europe, so the recent Socialist and Communist uprisings herald the impending collapse of the present financial and industrial plutocracy. For socialization of the means of production has become the order of the day, just as the establishment of the free market was the order of the day two and three hundred years ago. And even in those countries where the forces of reaction have

won a Pyrrhic victory in the form of Fascism, the free market which is the hall-mark of capitalism has either been restricted or has disappeared entirely.

I cannot, however, concur with those disciples of Marx who claim that they are promoting the revolution to end revolutions. In my opinion, they are accomplishing no more than a shift of power from one class to another—which, in all conscience, ought to satisfy anybody. But I see no reason to suppose that after the ownership of the means of production has been socialized, the history of humanity will then revert to what it was under primitive communism, a struggle between man and nature in place of the present struggle between man and man. Yet it is precisely because the Marxists make the extravagant claims they do and take the whole world and the hereafter (if any) as their province, that they deserve such serious attention and respect. Nothing short of a complete philosophy can sustain a successful revolutionary movement, and in spite of—indeed, because of—their sweeping claims, the future belongs to the Marxists, not to Major Douglas's Social Creditors, Mr. Roosevelt's New Dealers, or Hillaire Belloc's Distributists.

Because of personal conditioning which is just as much a part of me as my conviction that socialization of the means of production is the outstanding historic issue of our time, I find it impossible to endorse, publicly or privately, all the policies of the Third International. Nor can I detect any revolutionary possibilities whatever in the Second International. From the point of view of strict Marxist doctrine, Trotzky's policy of world revolution appeals to me much more than Stalin's policy of building socialism in one country, but Trotzky's lack of following and the success of the orthodox Communists in attracting the most militant labour leaders persuade me that Simon-pure Marxism has its defects and that the letter killeth.

But where I part company from all Marxists is in my belief in original sin—that is to say, the ineradicable lusts and fears of humanity. Soviet Russia has proved that human nature can be changed by changing environment. It has shown that many neuroses peculiar to Western civilization can be eliminated. It has shown that the qualities needed for a successful career in the United States become vices in another society. But Soviet Russia has not yet demonstrated that man can live without desire for power or dread of fear. The same fundamental emotions operate, but in a different social framework and toward a different end.

For me this is more than enough. Although I reject the Utopian elements of Marx, they are precisely what convince me that the Marxist to-day is what the Christian was in 200 A. D. or the Protestant in the 16th century. And the issue is not between Stalin and Trotzky or between Communism and Fascism, or between faith and scepticism. The issue is whether the whole world (which has now become one) is

about to enter upon a new and universal Dark Age, or whether it will survive the present period of transition and humanity will once again escape the fate of the dinosaur.

QUINCY HOWE

II.—AS AN IDEALIST VIEWS IT

I believe that a radically different philosophy of life must be sought so that we may overcome the present crisis, which neither Communism nor Fascism can solve. My personal philosophy coincides with the ideal of social disinterestedness, which is the basis of Socialism, Communism, or Internationalism. The ideas which I ardently desire to "propagate" are identical with that philosophy which is entirely spiritual. I am an Idealist. To me the world we apprehend is a derivative from consciousness, which is the matrix of all Nature's happenings. Consciousness is spread out in space and time in all forms of living matter. To adjust ourselves wholly and integrally to our surroundings *en masse*, we must reach a level of consciousness which is the source and support of our manifold experiences. This represents at once the most complete adaptation to the world and the fullness of human personality.

It is mystical intuition alone which can achieve this end. Personality—the energy considered in the natural sciences and emotional intensity in man's social, æsthetic and religious attitudes—is generally called the *Atman*, *Purusha* or Soul. It is not a hypothesis with me, subject to change, but a mystical apprehension deeply felt and profoundly stirring me to activity.

Personality or Soul is the one Reality, the source of mind and world, both as cause and as effect. The Reality is the Substance of the totalities of experience. In the Reality all the distinctions of knowledge, knower and known disappear. The Reality is Truth. Truth is neither witness nor witnessed but simply IS. Truth apprehended by our emotions becomes beauty. In man's social relations and activities, the reality is realised as charity or goodness. Truth, Beauty and Goodness are the indivisible manifestations of Reality, the partial phases of which reveal themselves to man, sharing the crudeness of his defining senses, his limited social affections and his circumscribed world of time and space in which such Reality has to be experienced. Man's progress can be envisaged in terms of the search for truth in the fields of science and knowledge; for beauty in creative art of forms and appurtenances which he adds to his environment; and for charity in his relations to fellow men.

It is misreading biology and history to assert that the only forces that have governed evolution are exploitation and competition,

lust and fear. Man emerges from a social stock and the character of struggle for existence is changed with the increase of co-operation and good will. Man's tools and implements throughout history have evolved from procuring subsistence, attacking forests and animals, turning up the soil and harnessing fire and water, coal and iron, electricity and gases, for his own diverse requirements. These have ensured progress only when their uses have been social. Whenever man's implements of production have been used by him against his fellow beings, progress has been jeopardised. Slavery in ancient Greece and in the United States before the Civil War, hereditary service of the Sudras in medieval India, and economic imperialism in Africa and Asia represent instances of man's tools and implements being used for antisocial ends and the deprivation of fellow men of amenities of life which a universal ethics must consider indispensable. Such uses of wealth, power and organisation, such methods of production and distribution as compel fellow men to live as inferior beings is morally unjustifiable and economically dangerous, as they upset the age-long evolutionary process which has selected man for the highest social destiny.

But the adoption and development of power-driven implements and machinery during the past two centuries have precipitated the greatest crisis of our civilization. The Industrial Revolution transferred labour from man to mechanical appliances driven by power-generating machines. The machines are for the most part self-sufficient and too large and complicated to be under the individual worker's control. The worker not merely loses zest and initiative but his own life must henceforth follow the rhythm of brute force of the machine. The machine knows neither excellence nor beauty. Both its method and its standard of work are dictated by inert materials and inorganic forces. Man must adapt himself to these in order to earn and live. The organic adaptation must be as close to mechanical standardisation as possible, for the machine standardises everything—tools and materials, process and product.

The mechanistic discipline of standardised mass production dominates man's interests and attitudes. The processes of standardised production in one industry interlock with those in a large number of other industries. Thus the machine process gradually absorbs all kinds of labour. Secondly, the daily routine of the workers' lives is standardised. The worker must fit his ideas, feelings and behaviour into a cold mechanical rhythm which carries him along like a wagon on rails. Thirdly, a mechanistic universe is envisaged by the worker. Uppermost in his mind is the intricate balance of mechanical appliances, raw materials and organized processes, governed by the laws of physics and chemistry. The latter determines his attitude towards Man and towards Nature.

He is worse off than the savage who face to face with an incompre-

hensible environment, seeks comfort by establishing a close relationship with plants, animals and natural phenomena. The machine has banished zest and interest from work. It satisfies only that group of impulses which gather round food-getting. Unlike the craftsman's tools and appliances, the machine is not an object towards which a harmonious blend of diverse impulses and desires, artistic, social or religious, can be projected.

The machine, like man, seeks an equilibrium but the equilibrium is never reached. Being soulless, the adjustment it seeks is by mere increase in size, and as it grows it becomes colossal, holding man more and more firmly within its iron grip. The machine process by its very extension destroys its own rhythm, and then a crash destroys machines, men and goods in terrible catastrophe. The mechanical domination is irrational, inexorable and pitiless.

Man, therefore, refuses to be standardised. He invented mechanics and chemistry to serve him, not for him to serve them. The machine cannot satisfy his feelings and aspirations and so he is in open revolt.

Man's tools are the extension of his limbs and organs. The widespread use of machinery, utilising vast resources of natural energy has meant a disproportionate increase of the size and strength of our organism, the soul remaining too weak to wield or guide it. In this machine-driven age a new philosophy must refashion man's personal life.

Neither Marx nor Lenin furnishes such a new philosophy. Both have stopped midway in the road towards rational social development. Communism has disciplined the life of the individual man to social aims and purposes and repudiated the motive of personal gain as the be-all and end-all of economic activity. Communism has "socialised" a bourgeois industrial civilization where the profit motive is the first law and where, in the name of formal freedom a vast amount of economic inequality and social misery is still tolerated. But co-operative production and guild control are transitional in the progress towards a better productive organisation and better distribution of wealth, leisure and the amenities of life. Many qualities needed in the bourgeois industrial civilisation in the West have been weeded out in Soviet Russia and along with these many neuroses, individual and social, associated with the canalisation of all desires into profit-seeking motive, the concentration of wealth in the unproductive minority and insecurity for the mass of productive workers.

Though we can see the dawn of a new, socialised personality, the replacement of struggling classes by professions which conceive work as service and a consequent gradual transformation of man's motives and aspirations, still the development has been but partial. The pursuit of truth is a matter of individual experimentation. It cannot thrive where public opinion is moulded according to anything of the nature of a creed or dogma, however

noble. Similarly creative art submits to no dictates, far less to mere economic considerations. A soulless mass standardisation is engendering in Russia neuroses different from those met in Capitalistic industrial civilisation.

Communism has discarded religion and replaced God by the social collectivity. By the denial of Religion, Communism has lost the only safe anchor, the perennial source and inspiration of good will and brotherhood. Institutional religion, it is true, often has served the interests of the directing classes and encouraged a slave mentality among the common people. But a living religion or mysticism which dwells in man's aspirations outlives both the class consciousness of ecclesiastics and the destruction of churches and idols. The idea of an anthropomorphic God is incompatible with right ideas about Nature, Man and Evolution. But it is the essence of mysticism to recreate the concept of deity and re-establish it as the source and inspiration of all values. In a Communist society without the idea of deity individual freedom and collective solidarity cannot be reconciled. Personality or Soul as the deity is the final unity of life. It will for ever arouse us to sacrifice and suffering for fellow men. The deity is the unique and immediate experience of world brotherhood in this imperfect society and not in a distant Utopia. Our affinity and kinship with It is a much surer basis for dealing with our fellow men than the academic distinction between altruism and selfishness or the Marxian law of a social evolutionary process.

Communism itself has become in some measure like a pathological religion, envisaging and enforcing an ideal with the ardent imagination and fanaticism of a bigot; but the resemblance between true religion and Communism is superficial and misleading. Communism has been not incompatible with social tyranny, by which it has sought to establish social justice. In Marx, Lenin and Stalin alike we find the Machiavellian conception of the end justifying the means, which destroys the very roots of spirituality. The Marxian Messianic hope of establishing a classless society through the gradual embitterment of the proletariat can only be realised through mobilisation of envy and rancour to an extent unthought of even in the society which it is sought to reform. The fear is well founded that Communism, with its discipline and persecution, its belief in one social framework and one type of culture, *viz.*, economism, may sap the vitality of that freedom of thought and conscience which is the very essence of spirituality.

Capitalism and social injustice can no longer be tolerated. But the new organization to replace these may develop on guild-regionalist, co-operative or socialist lines, according to the cumulative effects of history, race and environment. One pattern of Communist industry and society cannot suit all cultures and economic stages. Further, it will be tightening and lengthening the chain of economic Karma to oppose Capitalism with proletarian revenge

and resentment even though organised as invincible political weapons. Indeed, the Communist belief that force must be exerted to create a new society is a continuation of the older bourgeois ideology. A true Communist society can only be achieved at a higher level than Lenin or Stalian accepts. It is only a spiritual attitude opposing the glorification of the State and of subordinate political mechanisms—the common ground of Communism and Fascism—that can reconcile the rival claims of freedom and solidarity, of personal initiative and collective discipline, of economism and culture.

Communism as an end is divine because it raises individual life to a supreme world-wide, collective endeavour. But Communism as a means is inhuman, for its rejection of the Religion of Life leads to rejection of man's personality or soul. It is only Communism sanctified by religion that can shed all its falseness and ugliness. Collectivity without an associated recognition of the beauty, freedom and grandeur of the individual defeats itself. Collectivity is a growing thing and different persons and groups will participate in it differently according to their mental patterns and culture.

True Religion alone can import into Communism the all-important attitude that love and justice are the very essence of the self and religion will implement by collective endeavour man's inherent desire and right to establish harmony with the entire social environment. In a sanctified Communism social virtues will be divested altogether of the character of law, but their realization will mean the full and effective development of personality. Social collectivity is to me not a matter of mere economics nor of social arrangement nor even something worshipped for what it is going to be in the future, as in the case of a Communist. It is my love and veneration for the True, the Good and the Beautiful, present though eternal, suffering and sinning and conquering with the world, in the Spiritual Unity of its collective life, which teaches me belief in the new social order, the Spiritual Commonwealth that is to be.

RADHAKAMAL MUKERJEE

GOD'S RESPONSIBILITY AND MAN'S FREEDOM

[In this article **Mr. C. E. M. Joad** examines the answers of *The Secret Doctrine* to the problems of sin and suffering. The attention of our readers is invited to the *Note* appended.—EDS.]

I have been reading that remarkable book, *The Secret Doctrine* by Madame Blavatsky. Much of it, I confess, I find obscure. The mode of exposition is often strange to the academic mind, and the Sacred Writings, upon which the bulk of Madame Blavatsky's text is a commentary, are necessarily unknown to me. Yet the obscurity is lit by flashes of penetrating insight, and the arguments, when I can follow them, seem to me often to lead with compelling force to demonstrably correct conclusions. Such is the argument to the effect that God is not the author of the evil in the world, and that He cannot, therefore, be considered to be omnicreative in the sense in which Christianity affirms him to be omnicreative. A second and allied argument is to the effect that man is really free and that his actions are not predetermined from the beginning by the intention or foreknowledge of the Creator. These positions, the omnicreativeness of God and the predetermination of man, of which the first is held by most, the second by many, Christians, which by asserting the universal creativeness of a personal God seem to deny the possibility of freedom to man, are, I believe, false. I wish, therefore, to enumerate some of the considerations which seem to me to tell conclusively against them, and then to relate these considerations to the arguments of Madame Blavatsky. I shall conclude by suggesting a possible difficulty in the position which she seems to me to be expounding.

The world, including all the human beings in it, is, according to the view common in the West, supposed to have been created as a result of a sudden act or series of acts by an omnipotent and benevolent God. Now the life of man in the world *as it appears* is shot through with pain. Men also continuously do one another evil. What account, then, are we to give of this pain and this evil? Two alternatives are possible: either (I) God created them or (II) He did not.

(I) Let us first suppose that God deliberately created them. Then we may suppose, further, that they are either (a) real, or (b) in some sense unreal or illusory. If (a) they are real, then the deliberate creation of pain and evil is the mark of a wicked person, and God is not benevolent. If (b) they are unreal, we must ask how it comes about that we believe them to be real. That we think we suffer, and that we think men do us evil, is undeniable. If these beliefs are false, in holding them we are making a mistake. God, aware of the fact that we are making this mistake, and knowing, in virtue of His omniscience, that

we should make it, yet deliberately permits us to err. He is, therefore, responsible for the introduction of error into the universe. Now, the deliberate creation of error is as incompatible with the character of a completely good being as the deliberate creation of pain and evil. Why, moreover, should God need to deceive us in the matter, even if we could suppose that He wished to do so? Deception springs from limitation; we find it necessary to deceive only when we cannot achieve our ends openly. An all-powerful being has not the need, an all-good being has not the wish, to deceive.

(II) Let us now suppose that God did not create pain and evil. Then they must exist independently of Him, being, on this view, distinct and separate factors or principles in the universe. If God is good, it is clear that He cannot desire that pain and evil should exist, and they must exist, therefore, in His despite. Hence, if God has the wish to remove them and cannot, it is because He is not all-powerful; if He has not the wish He is not all-good.

Sometimes an attempt is made to reconcile the existence of pain and evil with that of an all-good God by attributing them to the activities of man. God, it is said, out of His infinite goodness, bestowed upon man the gift of free will. Man has abused this gift to create evil, and pain is the necessary accompaniment of evil. If we ask why man does these things, the Christian answer is, because of the Fall. But is this answer satisfactory in the sense required; does it, that is to say, absolve God from responsibility? It is clear that man could not create pain and evil out of nothing. They must spring from the innate dispositions and potentialities of his nature. It was because he was a creature of such a kind that he acted in such a way. Now, these innate dispositions and potentialities in virtue of which he so acted were implanted in him by whom? We can only answer, by man's Creator, who is thus found to be responsible, if not for the actual introduction of pain and evil into the world, at least for the creation of beings with the potentialities from which pain and and evil inevitably sprang. The reply that there was no inevitability about it, that man was free to do as he chose, and that the responsibility, is, therefore, man's and not God's, is evidence of our good intentions towards God, but is otherwise not convincing. God, being omniscient, must have known what the result of creating the human race would be. He must, that is to say, have known that men would utilise their gift of free will to introduce pain and evil into the world. Therefore he deliberately permitted the introduction of pain and evil into a world that knew them not. In other words, he deliberately made the experiment of creating the human race, knowing that evil would come of it. But this is not the conduct of an all-good being.

Next let us consider the question of human free will. God is supposed to be omniscient. If so, He knows everything; therefore He knows the future; He knows, therefore, what is going to happen, and, as He cannot

make a mistake, the future is determined because of God's knowledge of it. Therefore, we are not free to make the future as we please; we are not even free to do this or to do that here and now since, as God knows which of the two we are going to do, our choice between them is already determined.

Finally there is the question of human conduct. An omnipotent, benevolent God can only do what is good and will what is good. For us to do good is, therefore, the same as to do God's will. Once this identification is established it is impossible to forget it; we cannot but remember that in doing good we are pleasing God, in doing evil displeasing Him. Now most religions have taken care to paint the respective consequences of pleasing and displeasing God in the liveliest colours, picturing in many cases an eternity of absolute bliss as a reward for the one, and of physical torture as punishment for the other. Thus the injunction to act in accordance with God's will becomes an exhortation not to piety but to prudence. We are offered a choice between two lives. In one we take out a short-term insurance policy, whose benefits are reaped in this life in the form of self-indulgence and a "good time"; the other involves a long-term policy, whose premiums are paid in the form of self-denial and mortification of the flesh in the present, for which we are rewarded by an eternity of divine joy in the hereafter.

Directly considerations of this kind are allowed to influence conduct, whether the influence is unconscious or avowed, it is idle to pretend that it is dictated by ethical motives. If we do good because it is God's will, a will of whose power we are only too conscious and to the dangers of thwarting which we are kept fully alive, it is clear that we do not do good for its own sake; we do not do it, in other words, because it is good. Yet the possibility of ethics depends upon our ability to prefer good to evil uninfluenced by any other consideration.

Now let us turn to Madame Blavatsky's teaching on the subject. Her view of God's relations to man is bound up with the concept of Karma. Passionately she denounces the doctrine that God is responsible for the pain and evil in the world. Steadfastly she rejects the notion of man's predestination. But this denunciation and this rejection are in her view only rendered possible provided that we are prepared to accept the doctrine of Karma. As man looks at the evil and pain around him "that blessed knowledge of Karma," she says, "alone prevents him from cursing life and man as well as their supposed Creator." Karma is not a subjective feeling in the heart of man. It is not even a law of man's making. It is part of the nature of things, a factor in the fundamental constitution of the universe. What ultimate reality may be, we cannot in our present stage of development divine. All that we can know is its phenomenal aspect. Now Karma is an "aspect" of the unknowable reality "in its effects in the phenomenal world." The

individual man is one of a limited number of eternal, spiritual monads originally "projected by higher and semi-divine Beings out of their own essences." The spirit passes through a number of separate incarnations according to an "ever-acting and never-erring law . . . plunging Spirit deeper and deeper into materiality on the one hand, and then *redeeming it through flesh* and liberating it."

The ultimate destiny of the human mind is to return to "absolute Deity" which is also its ultimate source. But, that it may return, it must first become perfect and selfless. This it does through suffering, which disciplines and purifies "the pilgrim soul" as it passes "through various *states* of not only *matter* but Self-consciousness." (*S. D.* I 175)

What, then, is the cause of this suffering? It is a necessary effect of the evil which the suffering soul has performed. For, enjoying the gift of freedom, inevitably it is free to do evil. Now that evil should entail suffering for the evildoer is the law of Karma, a law as universal as that fires burn upwards and water flows downwards. In fact, since its application is not confined to spirits embodied in the material world, it is more universal than these physical laws. Now if through doing evil we provoke the application of this law, we shall suffer, and the suffering is determined. But it does not follow that the doing of evil is determined. Nor is it fair to blame God or the universe because suffering is evil's inevitable result. All that is determined is that, if we do evil, we shall pay for it; but we are free not to do it. Madame Blavatsky uses a striking analogy to enforce the point. "It is not the Wave which drowns a man, but the *personal* action of the wretch, who goes deliberately and places himself under the *impersonal* action of the laws that govern the Ocean's motion." Karma is impersonal as the ocean is impersonal. "It creates nothing, nor does it design. It is man who plans and creates causes, and Karmic law adjusts the effects." This is admirable. It satisfies three of the most difficult requirements of a theology. It shows, first, how suffering comes to be in the world. Secondly, it absolves God from responsibility for such suffering. Thirdly, it makes provision for the fact of human freedom, while showing how the results of human actions are determined.

I now come to my question. It is, we are told, "man who plans and creates causes." Why, then, does he plan and create as he does? Presumably because of the Karma which he has laid up for himself by his planning and creating in the past, a past which may stretch back over a large number of different lives. We are forced back, then, in our enquiry, to the initial planning and creating by the original individual monad living his first life as a human being. It will be remembered that this first incarnation of the monad as a human being was "projected by higher and semi-divine Beings out of their own essences." Now these semi-divine Beings were, presumably, free. But could they in the course of their free

willing, will evil? And if they could not, could their "projected essences" will evil? Let us take the argument back yet one stage further. The semi-divine Beings themselves were, we are told, projected out of the ethereal body of the Creator. Presumably, then, their nature must be continuous with His, as man's is with theirs. Now we cannot conceive of the Creator as willing evil. How, then, if God Himself did not will it—and I agree that He did not—does the first willing of evil occur? Our question, then, is this: "What, in Madame Blavatsky's theology, is the solution of the most difficult problem for any theology, the problem of evil?"

C. E. M. JOAD

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

Mr. Joad speaks of Madame Blavatsky's "theology," which term is associated with creedalism and priestly craft, and is likely to convey the wrong impression that she claims for her teachings the ready acceptance of blind belief. Philosophy would be the correct term to apply to her teachings, which she offered for study and examination; the difference between her position and that of any other philosopher may be set down thus—Madame Blavatsky did not claim original invention for her teachings; she wrote:—

> To the public in general and the readers of the "Secret Doctrine" I may repeat what I have stated all along and which I now clothe in the words of Montaigne: Gentlemen "I HAVE HERE MADE ONLY A NOSEGAY OF CULLED FLOWERS, AND HAVE BROUGHT NOTHING OF MY OWN BUT THE STRING THAT TIES THEM." Pull the "string" to pieces and cut it up in shreds, if you will. As for the nosegay of FACTS—you will never be able to make away with these. You can only ignore them, and no more. (*The Secret Doctrine* I. xlvi)

Thus there is no philosophy of Blavatsky as there is, say, a philosophy of Hegel or of Kant.

Here we may also comment on Mr. Joad's remarks on the mode of exposition used by Madame Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine*. It *is* a mode foreign to the modern academic mind. Madame Blavatsky could write in a lucid style as her numerous articles and other writings show; but she wrote *The Secret Doctrine* with an eye to helping the reader to develop his Intuition. What appears to be an involved style and an unmethodical presentation is but a device to compel the reader to make his own collation, tabulation and classification by a serious study of the book, which develops the faculty of Intuition. It is this very faculty which, as Mr. Joad puts it, lights up the obscurity of the text "by flashes of penetrating insight." Not only does the already functioning Intuition of the reader lead him "with compelling force to demonstrably correct

conclusions," put forward in the two volumes, but the latter also aid the sincere mind to evolve the faculty of intuition.

Mr. Joad has adequately summed up *The Secret Doctrine* teachings on God's responsibility and Man's freedom :—

1. God is not the author of evil.
2. Man is a free-will being.

Further, his logical mind is attracted by the doctrine of Karma which explains that sorrow is of our own making. "Oh ye who suffer, know ye suffer from yourselves." But why does man will evil? How does the first willing of evil occur?

The Esoteric Philosophy expounded by Madame Blavatsky does answer the question. But the present writer, who is only a student of *The Secret Doctrine*, is at a disadvantage; the answer, to be complete and illuminating, would require a small volume, not an article.

However, an attempt must be made to respond to Mr. Joad and to other minds like him, who are evincing an interest in the ideas and views put forward by H. P. Blavatsky.

To understand the subject it is necessary to get some perception of what Deity is and what Man. Mr. Joad indicates what God is not, but what Deity is according to *The Secret Doctrine* does not seem clear to him. *The Secret Doctrine* rejects the existence of a Personal God or Creator; nor does it admit the theological view of creation, *viz.*, the deliberate act of a self-conscious Being :—

> Our present quarrel is exclusively with theology. The Church enforces belief in a personal god and a personal devil, while Occultism shows the fallacy of such a belief. (II. 475).

But the Esoteric Philosophy denies Deity no more than it does the Sun. How does it describe it?

> The fundamental LAW in that system, the central point from which all emerged, around and toward which all gravitates, and upon which is hung the philosophy of the rest, is the One homogeneous divine SUBSTANCE-PRINCIPLE, the one radical cause. . . .
>
> It is called "Substance-Principle," for it becomes "substance" on the plane of the manifested Universe, an illusion, while it remains a "principle" in the beginningless and endless abstract, visible and invisible SPACE. It is the omnipresent Reality: impersonal, because it contains all and everything. *Its impersonality is the fundamental conception* of the System. It is latent in every atom in the Universe, and is the Universe itself. (I. 273)
>
> It [*The Secret Doctrine*] admits a Logos or a collective "Creator" of the Universe; a *Demi-urgos* in the sense implied when one speaks of an "Architect" as the "Creator" of an edifice, whereas that Architect has never touched one stone of it, but, while furnishing the plan, left all the manual labour to the masons; in our case the plan was furnished by the Ideation of the Universe, and the constructive labour was left to the Hosts of intelligent Powers and Forces. But that *Demiurgos* is no *personal* deity, *i. e.*, an imperfect *extra-cosmic god*,—but only the aggregate of the Dhyan-Chohans and the other forces. (I. 279–280)

The Universe then is a living assemblage of intelligences of many degrees; only one class of these intelligences comprises the human kingdom. *The Secret Doctrine* teaches a double evolution simultaneously taking place—Spirit's

involution into Matter downwards and Matter's evolution into Spirit upwards. Some classes of beings are descending from the planes of spirit to those of matter; others are ascending from the planes of matter to those of spirit. The human kingdom occupies the middle position. (*cf. S. D.* II. 180)

The ultimate root of Good and Evil, metaphysically speaking, is Spirit and Matter—the two aspects of the One Life.

> Archaic philosophy, recognizing neither Good nor Evil as a fundamental or independent power, but starting from the Absolute ALL (Universal Perfection eternally), traced both through the course of natural evolution to pure Light condensing gradually into form, hence becoming Matter or Evil. (I. 73)
>
> Good and Evil are twins, the progeny of Space and Time, under the sway of Maya. Separate them, by cutting off one from the other, and they will both die. Neither exists *per se*, since each has to be generated and created out of the other, in order to come into being; both must be known and appreciated before becoming objects of perception, hence, in mortal mind, they must be divided. (II. 96)
>
> In human nature, evil denotes only the polarity of matter and Spirit, a struggle for life between the two manifested Principles in Space and Time, which principles are one *per se*, inasmuch as they are rooted in the Absolute. (I. 416)
>
> Esoteric philosophy shows that man is truly the manifested deity in both its aspects—good and evil, but theology cannot admit this philosophical truth. (II. 515)

All beings other than human merely follow the law of their own order and *cannot* go against Nature's impersonal movements. In kingdoms other than the human there can be no evil in the sense of deliberate wrongdoing for there is no possibility of disobeying Nature.

> The Demon of Pride, Lust, Rebellion, and Hatred, has never had *any being before* the appearance of physical conscious man. It is man who has begotten, nurtured, and allowed the fiend to develop in his heart; he, again, who has contaminated the indwelling god in himself, by linking the pure spirit with the impure demon of matter. And, if the Kabalistic saying, "*Demon est Deus inversus*" finds its metaphysical and theoretical corroboration in dual manifested nature, its practical application is found in Mankind alone. (II. 274)

The duality of Spirit and Matter assumes in man a different aspect and that phenomenon alone explains why man has free will and can choose the path of darkness or of light. Spirit and matter, as two aspects of the One Life, are everywhere, but they reach a peculiar state in their relation to each other in the human kingdom. They have reached a balance position in man. The human kingdom is made up of "those Intelligences that have reached the appropriate equilibrium between matter and spirit." (I. 106) Because of this, man alone of all beings or forces in Nature is self-conscious. He alone has the power to compare, to contrast and to draw conclusions and this implies possession of free will or self-choice.

Because of this balance position, man is like the centre of a magnifying glass at which a perfect reproduction of the sun becomes possible; therefore Man becomes the miniature copy of the whole universe. In him reside all Nature's energies. The human Soul, whose

chief characteristic is self-consciousness, occupies the balance plane between the divine and the demoniac. Therefore says Madame Blavatsky :—

> Unless the Ego takes refuge in the Atman, the ALL-SPIRIT, and merges entirely into the essence thereof, the personal Ego may goad it to the bitter end. This cannot be thoroughly understood unless the student makes himself familiar with the mystery of evolution, which proceeds on triple lines—spiritual, psychic and physical. (II. 109)
>
> Owing to its identity with the ALL-FORCE, which, as said, is inherent in the Monad, it is all-potent on the *Arupa*, or formless plane. On our plane, its essence being too pure, it remains all-potential, but individually becomes inactive : *e. g.*, the rays of the Sun, which contribute to the growth of vegetation, do not select this or that plant to shine upon. Uproot the plant and transfer it to a piece of soil where the sunbeam cannot reach it, and the latter will not follow it. So with the Atman: unless the higher Self or EGO gravitates towards its Sun—the Monad—the lower *Ego*, or *personal* Self, will have the upper hand in every case. (II. 110)

But if there is a danger of wrong choice, there is the equal possibility of choosing rightly, and when man through his self-induced and self-devised ways and means attains union with the Divine in him, man becomes the highest being in the Universe.

> Man . . . being a compound of the essences of all those celestial Hierarchies may succeed in making himself, as such, superior, in one sense, to any hierarchy or class, or even combination of them. " Man can neither propitiate nor command the *Devas*," it is said. But, by paralyzing his lower personality, and arriving thereby at the full knowledge of the *non-separateness* of his higher SELF, from the One absolute SELF, man can, even during his terrestrial life, become as " One of Us." Thus it is, by eating of the fruit of knowledge which dispels ignorance, that man becomes like one of the Elohim or the Dhyanis ; and once on *their* plane the Spirit of Solidarity and perfect Harmony, which reigns in every Hierarchy, must extend over him and protect him in every particular. (I. 276)
>
> Evil will ever predominate unto the day when Humanity is redeemed by the true divine Enlightenment which gives the correct perception of things. (II. 515)
>
> Nor would the ways of Karma be inscrutable were men to work in union and harmony, instead of disunion and strife. For our ignorance of those ways—which one portion of mankind calls the ways of Providence, dark and intricate ; while another sees in them the action of blind Fatalism ; and a third, simple chance, with neither gods nor devils to guide them—would surely disappear, if we would but attribute all these to their correct cause. With right knowledge, or at any rate with a confident conviction that our neighbours will no more work to hurt us than we would think of harming them, the two-thirds of the World's evil would vanish into thin air. Were no man to hurt his brother, Karma-Nemesis would have neither cause to work for, nor weapons to act through. It is the constant presence in our midst of every element of strife and opposition, and the division of races, nations, tribes, societies and individuals into Cains and Abels, wolves and lambs, that is the chief cause of the " ways of Providence. " (I. 643)

THE WORLD IS ONE

WESTERN RELIGION AND INTERNATIONALISM

[**J. D. Beresford's** analysis of the failure of official Christianity is straightforward and correct. The remedy he suggests is impracticable inasmuch as the task outlined by him can be done by individuals only. The existing churches cannot be reformed because of the institution of the salaried priest pledged to carry out a definite programme. The plan sketched by Mr. Beresford implies some study and not mere reading of the Gospels, and traditional beliefs are bound to stand in the way of a correct understanding. The most formidable obstacle will arise from the superstition of the otherwise reasonable Christian who is prejudiced in favour of his own faith as the best and superior to all existing religions. Not only in Christendom but elsewhere also this superiority complex persists, injuring the cause of Brotherhood, as will be evident from a survey of the Eastern religious situation to be published in this series.—EDS.]

Although Islam has at various periods invaded Europe, holding for a time the South of Spain, penetrating as far inland as Hungary, and establishing a permanent base in Turkey, when we speak of Western Religion we think only of Christianity. For nineteen hundred years it has dominated Europe and spread thence to every corner of the earth. And because Christianity has produced great saints and mystics, and has proved itself to be a dominant religion to which evangelists have been able to make ready converts from every other creed, it is necessary in the first place to make some examination of the reasons for its failure.

We must begin any such account by the reminder that Christianity as such is split into a very host of separate sects, all differing from one another in points of dogma and doctrine. Chief among these sects are Roman Catholicism, Greek Catholicism, Anglicanism, and Nonconformity—a category that may be stretched to include Lutherans, Methodists, Calvinists, Baptists and various minor denominations. But the tenet held by all of them, the essential teaching of every Christian Church, is that of salvation by the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. If that one informing principle were abstracted from Christianity, all the virtue would be gone from it so far as the Churches are concerned. Its symbol is the Cross, which stands as a perpetual reminder of the death that was to atone for all man's misdeeds. Its power to make converts, its survival value, its immense influence throughout the vast empire of Christendom, are all due to this one overruling principle. The method of Roman Catholicism has interposed the Virgin Mother and a hierarchy of Saints between believers and the Christ, but only as intercessors. Ultimately He, and He alone, is regarded as the Saviour of the World.

The most obvious weakness of the teaching of salvation by vicarious sacrifice is its tendency to shift the

responsibility for well-doing from the individual believer. He is taught that the indispensable condition for salvation is a belief in Christ, and that doctrine has necessarily been extended to include the possibility of a "deathbed repentance." The dying thief on the cross is cited as the authoritative instance, though indeed we have no evidence as to what his life had actually been. It is easily conceivable, for instance, that it had been one of self-sacrifice, and his only recorded speeches testify to the worth of his character. There is, however, no need to insist further upon this point. To the Theosophist, it is an obvious absurdity that any one who had lived a selfish and evil life, could on his deathbed find instant salvation by the mere profession of belief. The real crux is, of course, that no such profession could possibly be anything but an intellectual affirmation. No man can "find Christ," in the true sense of that mystical phrase, unless he has sought Him throughout life.

This shifting of responsibility, this teaching that "faith" is the prime essential, however tardily it may be avowed, has been used to give authority to the priesthood and has become the most powerful weapon of sectarianism. "Faith" was shown to intend not so much the belief in, and devoted practice of, the teachings of Jesus, as adherence to the theological dogma of a particular sect. The disciple of whatever variety of the Christian Church he might subscribe to, was taught that some trifling difference of doctrine was of vital importance to Salvation; and this teaching combined with the belief that Christ had taken the onus of sin upon Himself, has inevitably worked to make the profession of the Christian religion more and more mechanical. Indeed, the services of the Churches, with their eternal repetition of a particular set form of words, can have little more efficacy than the Buddhist prayer-wheel.

At various intervals, the complacent acceptance of the two formulas upon which the Churches rely has been violently disturbed by the urgent attack of such reformers as Calvin, Luther, Wesley or Fox. In every case the reaction represented by these attacks has been towards the need for personal effort. The invading doctrine declared that faith without works was of no avail, as a man lived so he died, and that he who would escape damnation must first find Christ and then practise His teaching in everyday life. These movements were obviously in the right direction, and the various sects they established exhibit more vitality at the present day than those which still cling to their original dogmas. But the zeal of the reformer soon became dissipated, and the original fallacy of the scapegoat persisted in every case —with the possible exception of the Society of Friends—to check the development of the reform.

Why this fallacy should have such a retarding influence on the development of Christianity, needs little exposition. We can see at once that the conception of a salvation obtained without cost of personal effort appeals to the natural leth-

argy of those, the overwhelming majority of mankind, whose spirit is unable to overcome the inertia of the flesh or, to speak more accurately, the psychical forces of Kāma —Desire. The inevitable result is that religion becomes one of the many departments of a man's or of a woman's life, a department to which resort may be had in times of emergency. At all other times it remains quietly in the background of the mind, a source of comfortable reassurance that no sin is unforgivable. In short, the *principle of vicarious sacrifice becomes a perpetual excuse for the failure of personal effort.*

The effect of nineteen hundred years of the Christianity founded upon these two principles as practised by its various sects can be read in European history. It has not only tolerated wars, it has fiercely created them. It has led to persecution, and the vilest cruelties and tortures. It has preached the justification of evil in order to obtain political power, and the heads and leaders of its churches have consistently ignored the implications of the Founder's "new" commandment —"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." It has been used as an excuse for the worst and narrowest forms of nationalism, and at the present moment Christianity, the religion of America and of all Europe, excepting Russia and Turkey, is an almost negligible factor in the great cause of peace.

It will be seen from this general indictment, which errs chiefly on the side of understatement, that sectarian Christianity as taught by the Churches does not even pretend to serve the cause of internationalism. The influence of the Pope, the most powerful of our Ecclesiastical Dignitaries, would not serve, even if it were exercised, to stop a war between two Roman Catholic countries. And in times of peace, the missionary work of the Christian Churches is carried on not to promote the universal brotherhood of mankind, but to make converts to some particular creed, the difference between one creed and the next depending upon some absurd point of dogma, such as whether the mother of Jesus was herself immaculately conceived.

Is there any justification for the practice of the Christian Churches as such? May we say, for instance, that it has served its turn, not too efficiently, in maintaining a moral standard? There can be little doubt, I think, that this is true up to a point. The mass of the people need the support of some spiritual belief to help them in the inhibition of those tendencies that civilisation has classified as amoral, the majority of such tendencies being, in fact, demonstrably unsocial. And the Churches, superstitiously invested with the authority of divine inspiration, have found in their creeds an admirable instrument for the inculcation of those cardinal virtues upon which the safety of Society as a whole depends. Whether or no the belief in these creeds is now becoming superfluous as a kind of moral strait-jacket is a point to which we are coming immediately. What concerns us at the moment is the evidence that in the past the teaching of Christianity has served to main-

tain and even to raise the general moral standard. We may take that at its lowest valuation, admit that our present condition falls most lamentably short of an ideal virtue, or even that, from one point of view, the effect produced is almost worthless. We may admit further that the method has been a false one, a method which has used precept, dogma and the threat of punishment in the manner practised by the worst forms of education. Nevertheless it can still be claimed with justice that the teaching in question has in the past helped to keep the mass of the people in order, to restrict individual license and to serve the purpose of those social principles which are necessary for the continuance of civilised life. Finally, it is at least arguable whether those purposes could have been upheld in any other way, having regard to the intellectual and spiritual development of the European peoples throughout the nineteen centuries under review.

But now having both condemned and defended the practice of dogmatic Christianity, we have to consider the vital question of a substitute. That the time is rapidly arriving at which such a substitute will be necessary there can be little doubt. We have seen, during the past eighteen years, the evolution in Russia of a people whose sole religion is to be the service of the State. This is to all intents and purposes the Positivism advocated by Auguste Comte. Its main object is the ultimate betterment of mankind on earth, and it lacks any eschatology. We have seen further in the same period a revolt against the domination of the priest in Spain, the supersession of the religious by the political arm in Germany, and the steady growth of agnosticism among the new generation in France and England. Parallel with these developments, there has been what may perhaps be regarded as complementary tendency to regimentation. We may be witnessing a gradual substitution, such as is taking place in the U. S. S. R., of civil for religious leadership, with social necessity taking the place of dogmatic Christianity, as the "strait-jacket" for personal, amoral desires. If that be true, we must be prepared for a period of chaos, since the influence of such a regimentation is all in the direction of a bigoted nationalism, and must inevitably terminate in a destructive war. We may hope, nevertheless, whatever may be the sufferings of this and the next generation, that out of the consequent chaos, a new spirit may arise, and that these tendencies we have indicated will serve as a preparation for the coming of a Teacher who will inaugurate a new world era.

Meanwhile what religion are we to teach to the youngest generation, to those who in another forty years may be the leaders of that new order? In my opinion, there is no need to look further, so far as the European is concerned, than the teachings of Jesus. There is little to be found there that is not in accord with the Ancient Wisdom-Religion, but all His sayings and parables must be reinterpreted in

the light of their original sources. Any one who comes to the New Testament after studying the *Bhagavad-Gita* or that admirable collection, *The Voice of the Silence*, will realise at once how closely the teaching of Jesus approximates to that set out in the works cited. We must not, of course, accept the Gospels as being verbally inspired. There are passages, either interpolated or erroneously reported, which on the face of them do not accord with the spirit that informs the teaching as a whole. But these exceptions are comparatively few, and even the Fundamentalists find it necessary to maintain a discreet silence in relation to some of them.

This reading of the Gospels will not, I need hardly say, include the doctrine of vicarious Sacrifice as taught by the Churches. The symbol of the Cross will be required in its true meaning, which is that the flesh must be made subservient to the spirit, a task that every man must undertake for himself. Nor will it include that other doctrine of Salvation by faith alone. All the sayings of Jesus that refer to faith in Himself as the Saviour, refer, as other of His sayings show clearly enough, to the Christ principle that is in every human being, the true ego, the immortal spirit. Wherefore salvation by faith intends not a miraculous conversion at the eleventh hour, but the realisation of that "Kingdom of God within," which is the sole inspiration of the religious life—a kingdom that cannot be found by those who have not earnestly sought it through long years of struggle.

Let me add in conclusion by way of apology to those who follow the great Teachers of the East, that this suggestion of adopting the true teaching of Jesus instead of going back to its original sources, is made because such a course would be more acceptable to the habit of European thought. It would maintain to a great extent the deep-seated tradition of Western ethics and philosophy which it would not be advisable to break, even if, as is highly improbable, the attempt to do so were likely to succeed. For us in the West the figure of the Christ is a very powerful symbol, and if it could be interpreted in its proper sense, freed from the mass of theology that has so efficiently disguised it, the creed of Europe would not differ in any essential from that of Theosophy.

J. D. BERESFORD

"No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse.

"Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved."

Matthew, IX, 16–17.

WHEAT

[**Dr. Irene B. Hudson**, M. R. C. S. (Eng.), L. R. C. P., M.B., B.S. (London), L. M. C. (Canada), is of English birth but has resided in British Columbia. Although she has been in active medical service in England and Canada for twenty years she is probably more widely known as a journalist and an author. She was the original compiler of *The Writers' Year Book* and was at one time editor of several magazines in London.—EDS.]

Certain names, such as the above, contain a potency to fire the imagination or to arouse memories. Whatever the magic of Wheat, the word alone stirs, for one, visions of rolling acres of rich prairie land; for another, the thought of small English fields with the wind blowing through the golden corn and blackberries ripening on the surrounding hedges; for yet another, pictures of ruined crops, memories of struggle and hardship. But wheat has other magic, the magic of gambling, of money-making! In Peace and in War, it serves as a basis for incessant gambling in the needs of nations and races. To us comes the recollection of a small child carrying devoutly a stalk of wheat in full ear. "How does it grow?" and the usual Christian answer: "God made it so!" Then a more enlightened friend put a grain of ripe wheat into the child's other hand, and said: "The one grows from the other; 'God' is in all." Thus do some hear of Nature's method of evolution, and the "magic" of propagation.

The sickle, the scythe, and the small horse-drawn mowing machine are things of the past in most countries, just as much as teams of oxen. But oxen do the ploughing in some parts of Africa and India even now, and horses are still more valuable on some types of farms than machinery. Even when the reaper-binder is used it may be necessary to set the sheaves up into stooks, and some hand labour is needed in most wheat areas, so man must still come into close contact with the wheat that he grows. The finest wheat sheaf of the crop is still sometimes offered up at the Harvest Thanksgiving—a propitiation or a thank-offering—symbolic, if we only knew it, of the sacred food of the gods.

Wheat is grown all over the world, except in hot and humid districts of the tropics. Dry sand and wet peat are not beloved of this cereal; otherwise, it grows in almost any soil. It thrives at sea level, or at 10,000 feet above the sea, in Tibet, Africa, Colombia, etc.; it will grow at the equator in Africa and America at an elevation, and it will grow north to the arctic circle, or even beyond, in some districts.

According to the *Encyclopædia Britannica,* there are three groups of cultivated species or races of wheat:—

I. Einhorn; cultivated by primitive peoples and used for cattle and horses.

II. Emmer (Macaroni wheat, Rivet wheat, Egyptian cone wheat, Khorasan wheat and Polish wheat). Emmer is one of the most ancient wheats, grown

by Neolithic people of Central Europe, and was the only wheat cultivated in Egypt in predynastic and dynastic times. It is still grown by primitive races in India, Persia, Abyssinia and Morocco for human food. In other parts of the world it may be grown for horses and cattle.

III. Bread Wheat (*Triticum Vulgare*) including all kinds of wheat from which bread is made, and supplying a large proportion of the food of the world.

From the same source we learn that the first records of history show the growing of wheat as an ancient industry, and the origin of the crop as a matter of tradition. The true origin is definitely prehistoric. Obscurity still prevails, and the ancestry of many of the races of wheat is purely problematic. The cultivated *Einhorn* may derive from a wild species of grass found in the hilly districts of South-eastern Europe and Asia Minor. Brittle-eared *Emmer* resembles a wild species found in the mountainous parts of Syria. But the source of the bread-wheat group is the most uncertain and obscure, for no wild plant has yet been discovered resembling any of these wheats. Professor Percival suggests that the bread-wheat group, with its vast number of varieties, has arisen by hybridization of a wheat of the Emmer group with two wild species of grass found in South-east Europe and Western Asia. But hybrids are usually sterile.

So much for the modern and more material aspect of wheat and its origin. Let us turn to *The Secret Doctrine* and find in Vol. II, pp. 373-74 : "We may remind the reader that *wheat has never been found in the wild state : it is not a product of the earth.* All the other cereals have been traced to their primogenital forms in various species of wild grasses, but wheat has hitherto defied the efforts of botanists to trace it to its origin." We know that wheat was sacred with the Egyptian priests in very ancient times, and was placed with their mummies, and found thousands of years later in their coffins.

"The servants of Horus glean the wheat in the field of Aanroo . . . . wheat *seven cubits high*," is a statement found in *The Book of the Dead.* But the fields of Aanroo are the place of Initiation, where the disembodied men seven cubits high (still supposed to be sevenfold with all their principles) glean or reap the wheat of their reward or punishment. Those in "a state of perfection," who are permitted to glean the wheat three cubits high, are those in the land of the rebirth of the gods, and are separated from their lower principles, either temporarily or permanently. Thus the "defunct" of the Egyptian allegory is given *Wheat,* the food of Divine Justice, on which he will live and prosper or which will kill him ; for he reaps the corn as the fruit of his actions during life. The deceased is either destroyed in this region, or becomes pure Spirit for the Eternity, in consequence of the "seven times seventy-seven lives" passed or to be passed on earth. And in *The Secret Doctrine,* we find it stated : "The Egyptians had the same esoteric philosophy, which is now taught by the cis-Himalayan adepts, who, when buried, have corn and wheat placed over them." (II. 374)

Further evidence as to the source

of wheat is given both in *The Secret Doctrine* and *The Book of the Dead.* The Kabiri are credited with having revealed, by *producing* corn or wheat, the great boon of agriculture. What *Isis-Osiris*, the once living Kabiria, has done in Egypt, that Ceres is said to have done in Sicily; they are all similar. Then again, the Egyptian Isis says: "I was the first to reveal to mortals the mysteries of wheat and corn.... I am she who rises in the constellation of the dog (Dog Star)." Sirius was the Dog Star and was the Star of Mercury or Budha, called the great instructor of mankind.

In the book of the Chinese Yi-King, the discovery of agriculture is attributed to "the instruction given to men by celestial genii."

That Wheat was regarded as the "gift of the gods" is an idea of universal acceptance, and by no means confined to ancient Egypt or ancient India. Mysterious, symbolic, and sacred are adjectives we may apply to wheat, and, while doing so we may better understand the almost universal custom of holding religious rites and ceremonies in connection with the sowing, reaping and harvesting of crops. Our modern minds revolt at the idea of human sacrifices to propitiate the tribal gods at these ceremonies, but we think nothing of the sacrifices we exact of souls and bodies in the struggle for existence, and in the attempt to amass fortunes, or prosecute (so-called) righteous wars. Anyone who studies the histories of religions can see clearly that the killing of animals and human beings was never originally intended as an offering to the gods. Such errors are the outcome of the degeneration and phallicism which have gradually permeated all formulated creeds, whether in the jungles of Africa or the wilds of America, or elsewhere.

The Papyrus of Ani in *The Book of the Dead*, as edited and translated by E. A. Wallis Budge, gives most valuable light on the importance of this symbolic wheat, both in the Initiation of Candidates, and (probably) in after-death states. In this wonderful record of Egyptian religious life, Ani is shown as overseer of the granaries of the temple, which formed the general storehouse for all the offerings. In one picture of the Papyrus, he is shown reaping the wheat, and the words "the Osiris reapeth" would suggest initiation and transformation. In another coloured plate Ani is shown driving the oxen round in a circle to tread out the corn, and again in another he kneels before two large heaps of grain holding the *Kherp* sceptre paying homage to these symbols of life eternal. As a candidate, Ani is given wheat by many gods, several of whom are credited with originating the staff of life. It is also said that this cereal is the food of *Kau* and *Khu*, or the Doubles and Spirit Souls. In the description of the XXXVth Plate of the Papyrus we find that the wheat is "three cubits high and the Spirit-souls reap it." From the same Plate we learn that Wheat and Barley were to be given to the Spirit-soul in the heavenly region, in the Company of the Gods, in the Celestial Mansions of Heaven.

Throughout the Papyrus of Ani,

which appears to be an account of Ani's Initiation, we find reference—all as if it was a most sacred symbol of life eternal—to Wheat, and, in the introduction to his translation, Mr. Wallis Budge gives an approximate date of 1300 to 1500 B. C. Some of us might well believe it to be vastly older, but have insufficient proof to adduce to that effect. Certainly, it may be read as a story of Initiation, and as such may be considered dateless and descriptive of very ancient ceremonials and mysteries.

Even the small portion of this story which deals with the uses of Wheat might bring back to any thinking man the sad fact that we moderns regard everything in the light of its material uses for the here and now. The Allegories of the Ancients may well be written in a cryptic language, for we will not understand them and apply them to ourselves, any more than we will consider the "vesture of food," Annamaya-Kosha, as the body is called, to be merely the temple of the god within, and not the god itself. The "cycle of necessity" that forces the sparks of the Universal Soul to be connected with the body and lower mind for the development of the individual and potential godhood, is the puzzle of the present generation. Our lack of true human qualities, our disregard of ethics and Nature's Law in our development of trade and our uses of scientific knowledge, place us among the "living dead" (*Voice of the Silence*), and too often sever all connection between us and our share of the Universal Soul, which we might once have believed to be our birthright.

No doubt we forget the Law of Nature when we gamble in the food of the gods, just as we gamble in War and in Peace, with the bodies and souls of living beings as our dice and pawns. If such be our sowing, what then can be our reaping and our harvest? In the fields of Aanroo, or elsewhere?

IRENE BASTOW HUDSON

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE MEANING OF "PROMETHEUS UNBOUND"

In a close and detailed study of Shelley's great lyrical drama Mr. Grabo's thesis is that "*Prometheus Unbound* is the work of a poet who had ceased to be a reformer and had become a philosopher"—a philosopher, too, who tried to reconcile three different schools of thought—the philosophical anarchism of Godwin and Holbach, the Neo-Platonism of Proclus, Porphyry and Plotinus, and the scientific speculations of Newton, Davy and Erasmus Darwin—while the ethics of Jesus are the very pivot of the poem. Whether or not the reader is satisfied with every detail of interpretation, Mr. Grabo has made the poem much clearer by throwing light on some difficult questions connected with it.

It is well known that Shelley was prompted to write his drama by reading the *Prometheus Bound* of Æschylus, but it is doubtful whether Shelley correctly understood the significance of that character in the Æschylean trilogy. Æschylus is believed to have written three plays on the myth, namely, *Prometheus, the Fire-bringer, Prometheus Bound* and *Prometheus Unbound*, of which only the second has come down to us. This trilogy is presumably on the same lines as those of his *Oresteia*, representing Crime, Punishment and Reconciliation. So it is more as an offender against the gods than as the champion of mankind that Æschylus conceived the character of Prometheus. There is no doubt that Zeus appears as a tyrant in *Prometheus Bound;* but it is only the Promethean side of the case that was given there. That representation was a dramatic necessity. It did not represent the final view of Æschylus. The very fact that Prometheus was made to reveal his secret and submit to the rule of the Father of the Gods in the lost drama of *Prometheus Unbound*, apart from the great feeling of reverence with which Zeus was treated in the other plays of Æschylus, especially the *Oresteia*, indicates that the ancient dramatist had a less exalted conception of the character of the Champion of mankind than his modern admirers have presumed. It is well known that classical dramatists were more interested in moral problems like the conflict of duties than in subtleties of characterization. The aim of Æschylus here apparently was to show to his countrymen that however good or public-spirited a man might be impiety would bring on punishment and that true freedom lay in submission to the Divine Will. But it is unfair to judge without the whole trilogy before us. We do not know in what convincing way the problems of the "complication" were solved in the "resolution" of the play, and by what natural steps the Heaven-defying hero was led to become its willing slave. Probably it was shown that by giving men fire and teaching them the arts, Prometheus had only increased their security and comfort and made them forget the higher powers above and that therefore his gifts were more a curse than a blessing to mankind. We do not know, but we are safe in assuming that Æschylus had no such sentimental admiration for Prometheus as the artists of the French Revolution period—Goethe, Beethoven, Byron and Shelley—had and that the poet of the free Republic of Athens would never have deliberately represented its highest God, Zeus, as a Tyrant and oppressor of mankind. Be that as it may, Shelley deliberately changed the sequel of the story and made Prometheus the ultimate victor and an independent parallel to Jesus Christ.

---

* *Prometheus Unbound—An Interpretation*. By CARL GRABO (The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill. $ 2.50)

But the point is that neither Shelley nor most of his critics seem to have realised how near he came to Æschylus in the "resolution" of the plot of his *Prometheus Unbound*. At the beginning of the drama we find Prometheus chained to a rock for unnumbered ages while an eagle tears his liver at the bidding of Jupiter, the tyrant of gods and men. At the end of the third Act—originally the end of the drama—we find Jupiter overthrown and Prometheus unbound and united with Asia, his love. How is this change brought about? What is the logic of events by which the intolerable tyranny of Jupiter is overthrown in the twinkling of an eye? If we say it is a miracle pure and simple, the whole structure of *Prometheus Unbound* as a drama falls to the ground, however wonderful its lyrics may be. There are some critics who state this conclusion boldly and frankly. For instance, Clutton-Brock says:—

> Prometheus represents all that is good in suffering humanity; Jupiter the tyrannous and external evil by which humanity is oppressed. Jupiter is suddenly and mysteriously overthrown and Prometheus is freed. At once the universe is cured of its disease, and all things rejoice in common.....Shelley's myth, of course, explains nothing. How could it? He assumes the wickedness of Jupiter and the goodness of Prometheus. But Jupiter's wickedness has no motive, and his overthrow is causeless. Something happens in the middle of the play; but Shelley cannot tell us what it is, because he does not know. Demagorgon appears and descends with Jupiter into the abyss; but we do not learn why he appears or how he contrives the fall of Jupiter, or even who he is, except that he is Eternity and the child of Jupiter, as Jupiter is of Saturn.

I have quoted this long passage because almost all the questions raised in it are answered by Mr. Grabo in the book before us. But let us first examine the "resolution." Is the overthrow of Jupiter causeless? Has there been no change in the attitude of the combatants? There has been, of course, no change in Jupiter. He remains the same old tyrant, cruel, implacable and exulting in his victory even at the last moment of his reign. But has there been no change in the mind of Prometheus? If not, what is the purpose of the first act? Why does Prometheus want others—the earth and the mountains, air and the whirlwinds—to repeat the curse which he once pronounced on his foe? Why does he not repeat it himself? The answer is contained in the following lines:—

> If then my words had power,
> Though I am changed so that aught evil wish
> Is dead within; although no memory be
> Of what is hate, let them not lose it now.
> It doth repent me: words are quick and vain;
> Grief for a while is blind and so was mine.
> I wish no living thing to suffer pain.

So then it is a repentant Prometheus that we have in the "resolution" of Shelley's drama as in the lost drama of Æschylus. The Prometheus of Æschylus, whose sin was disobedience, submits once more to the Divine Will and is released, while the Prometheus of Shelley, whose sin was hatred, ceases to hate his enemy and forthwith his chains fall from him. The classical poet's God, like the God of the Old Testament, is a God of Fear, the Christian poet's God, a God of Love. For Shelley, though he hated institutional Christianity, accepts here the ethics of Christ as well as the philosophy of Neo-Platonism and believes that the ultimate power in the universe, that which he calls the One, is Eternal Love. In passing, it may be remarked that if a Hindu poet were dealing with this myth, he would make the sin of Prometheus one of error, for the Hindu God is a God of Reality, transcending relativity; all sins have their origin in delusion, and release is only through *jñana* or realisation.

If Shelley's God is Eternal Love, who is Jupiter? Jupiter is not the embodiment of "tyrannous and external evil" as Clutton-Brock supposed. Nor does Shelley "represent evil as external" and "falsify the true conception of human progress," as Dowden imagined. Jupiter represents all the hideous conceptions of God from which all the institutional religions in the world derive their thunders. He is an imitation God, made by man. That is evidently the meaning of the words of Prometheus when he says:—

> "Ay, do thy worst. Thou art omnipotent.
> O'er all things but thyself I gave thee power
> And my own will." . . . .
> . . . Evil minds

> Change good to their own nature. I gave all
> He has, and in return he chains me here"
> Years, ages, night and day.

Shelley knows full well that evil is in the nature of man and not imposed on him by a celestial tyrant. And what is most noteworthy is that the remedy he suggests in *Prometheus Unbound* is the right remedy, a radical improvement on the remedies suggested in his earlier poems—*Queen Mab* and *The Revolt of Islam.* The remedy may be given in the words of Mr. Grabo :—

> Utopia is no longer a matter of a few reforms and the overthrow of kings and priests. Man must change his own character; love must displace hate... (p. 8)
> Shelley is no social visionary in *Prometheus Unbound.* The golden age is to come as the reward not of revolution but of the slow ethical change in man himself. Man must become a kind of god before he is free. (p. 39)

Especially interesting is Mr. Grabo's attempt to trace the influence of Neo-Platonism in Shelley's symbolism of clouds, caves, fountains and wildernesses. According to him Ione and Panthea are respectively the sense of beauty and the spirit of sympathy, the sisters of Asia, who represents Love or Nature. Demagorgon is the divine energy which precedes all individual forms. It corresponds to the third hypostasis in the Neo-Platonic Trinity consisting of Eternal Love, Creative Intellect and Creative Energy. It approximates the Vedic Hiranyagarbha and the Christian Holy Ghost. We now understand why Shelley represents Demagorgon as formless, living in a far-off, obscure cave and coming up in its chariot at the destined hour to hurl down Jupiter from his throne and create a new order of things. The journey of Asia and Panthea to the cave of Demagorgon, so beautifully described in the second act, therefore symbolises the quest after the ultimate reality that lies back of all created things. As Mr. Grabo puts it, "Asia and Panthea are reversing the processes of life, moving backward in time through the generation of sou'ls and through the basic elements of matter to that preëxistence which only is reality." (p. 68) In proof he quotes Asia's song :—

> We have passed Age's icy caves
> And Manhood's dark and tossing waves,
> And Youth's smooth ocean, smiling to betray :
> Beyond the glassy gulfs we flee
> Of Shadow-peopled Infancy,
> Through Death and Birth to a diviner day.

Mr. Grabo seems to be on much surer ground here than when he identifies the Spirit of the Earth with electricity, the Star on its forehead with the negative electrode or "the sun-like lightnings that reveal the secrets of the earth's deep heart" with X-rays. Shelley no doubt was interested in the scientific thought of his time as well as in Platonism and Neo-Platonism. We are grateful to Mr. Grabo for drawing our attention to the raw materials out of which Shelley wove his wonderful poem. But once on the track of exploring the sources of a great composition we are tempted to read meanings into words which the poet never intended. Mr. Grabo has not perhaps completely overcome this temptation.

D. S. SARMA

India and Britain, A Moral Challenge. By C. F. ANDREWS (Students' Christian Movement Press, London. 5*s.*)

C. F. Andrews is an indefatigible worker for India whose love for the Motherland is as great as it is sincere. He is a Christian, and how many men and especially Britons deserve that appellation? Earnestness and devotion are his chief characteristics and their hallmark is on this new volume. It presents the arguments in favour of and against British influence in India and in conclusion offers a moral challenge, not only to the British but also to us Natives, whatever our religion or social status. The church missionary comes in for a deserved rebuke. The chapter on "Cultural Gain and Loss" is thought-provoking but incomplete, inasmuch as the real issues of cultural fundamentals are not thrashed out.

P.

Changing Views on Marriage and Family (Hindu Youth). By K. T. MERCHANT, M. A., LL. B. (B. G. Paul & Co., Madras. Rs. 3, As. 8)

Mr. Merchant has compiled the answers to a questionnaire and made of them a book. It is statistical—and disappointing. Were it the representative voice of India's youth speaking from these pages one might view with alarm the lethal influence of Western psychology as determined by psycho-analysis and the cult of personal aggrandizement. Especially is this applicable to the statements pertaining to birth control; for it would seem that this custom is now being taken up by Indians at a time when the West itself is beginning to question it.

India's ultra-moderns would do well to consider the record of their Western brothers before advocating such a practice. A few pronouncements of Western authorities on the subject we take at random. They are the result of years of research as well as intimate human contacts. From the pen of Dame Mary Scharlieb, D.B.E., M.D., M.S., we have :—

Marriage is not intended as a mere sanction of cohabitation; nor is it intended to be a shield for self-indulgence and selfishness, but it exists for the high and holy purpose of the increase of the human race .... In the case of young couples who think that the postponement of the advent of their firstborn may be advisable on grounds of health or of convenience, it might be pointed out to them that the employment of artificial methods of Conception Control... are not infrequently followed by permanent sterility. ...The whole aspect and story of artificial control appears to be sordid and unnatural and when the immediate risks and the probable future consequences are realized it is difficult to understand that anyone should be found willing to practise or to advise such methods.

Arthur E. Giles, M.D., B. Sc., F.R.C.S., writes :—

Nature never forgives, and never remits a penalty incurred. So when men deliberately break her rules, it is well that they should realize that harmful results must necessarily follow . . . These considerations apply to Birth Control, which is an insult to Nature and a violation of her laws.

Again, from Angus Watson, Newcastle-on-Tyne :—

During the last twenty years as a result of the teaching of the psycho-analytical school . . . humanity has assumed that it can safely substitute so-called self-expression for self-control, and that the old sanctions of morality, built up through the centuries by the collective experiences of mankind, are inadequate and out of date. This viewpoint has been a prelude more than once in the past history of the world to a temporary breakdown in civilisation. There is no satisfactory alternative to self-discipline.

And J. F. McCann, M.D., F.R.C.S. :—

The effects of frustrated fecundity will be borne in upon the mind even of the sceptic, when the amount of disease of the reproductive organs (especially in the female) so produced [by the use of contraceptives] is contrasted with the good health of those whose natural functions continue undisturbed.

Meddlesome interference with reproduction is not merely injurious to the individual, it is disastrous to the State, and should be checkmated before its influence has corroded the very foundation of our existence as a great nation.

Esoteric philosophy teaches that " Creative powers in man were the gift of divine wisdom.... Nor was the curse of Karma called down upon them for seeking *natural* union, as all the mindless animal-world does in its proper seasons; but, for desecrating the divine gift, and wasting the life-essence for no purpose except bestial personal gratification.... The animal element, and *consciousness* of its possession, has changed periodical instinct into chronic animalism and sensuality. It is this which hangs over humanity like a heavy funereal pall."

Birth control, to be sure, is only one of the problems relating to home and family dealt with in this book. The replies to the questionnaire on marriage by consent or by free self-choice, the joint-family or the single-family system, co-education and the optimum age for marriage, all come in for analysis. The majority verdict in favour of contraceptives, however, is symptomatic of the tone of the whole book. There are noteworthy exceptions. Some answers to the questionnaire do uphold the spiritual concept of marriage and the home, " the Vedic conception of wife as the best friend," but these are conspicuous by their rarity.

The statements recorded in this volume, even by so small a number of

young Indian men and women, cause the reader to ask, what has become of the spiritual knowledge that is the rightful inheritance of this ancient land? Where is the Law of Karma? And where are the Statutes of Manu?

M. JAMES

The Sayings of the Ancient One. By P. G. BOWEN. (Rider and Co., London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

The book has two divisions which follow "Introductory Notes."

The first portion (Sections II to IV) is made up of translations from a volume written in Isinzu, "an archaic form of Bantu unknown to Philology" (p. 11), "held by the Berber philosopher and teacher Mehlo Moya," who allowed Captain Bowen to translate and publish only three fragments from it.

The second portion (Sections V to VII) are explanatory articles by the translator, who is a keen student of the writings of H. P. Blavatsky. He states:

> I can say merely that, *as far as I understand them,* I find the teachings of Madame Blavatsky to be essentially the same as those which I have had from Mehlo Moya, which he asserts are derived from *The Sayings of The Ancient One.*

The second section is a lucid exposition of Captain Bowen's understanding of Theosophy, and students will note with interest that he has attempted to use definite words for definite things; thus he defines Theosophy, Divine or Universal Wisdom, as

> That divine consciousness which perceives all things as inseparable parts of an indivisible whole that is infinite and perfect. (p. 154)

From every point of view the first section is the more valuable; first, as indicating that the Knowledge about the Inner Path of the Soul is both ancient and universal; secondly, it will form for a perhaps not negligible number, a guide or a friend.

"The Ancient One" is no man, but Universal Wisdom (p. 142) manifesting through a particular School. The translator-author is an able exponent of its lofty metaphysics and noble ethics. He offers us three fragments that are exquisite symbolic representations of the teachings of Divine Wisdom, whose truths are ageless, whose laws are raceless and whose ideas are deathless.

"The Wilderness of the Mind of Man" is an allegory describing "the descent of man from a divine unself-conscious state and his return through many phases of human experience to a state of full spiritual self-consciousness." (p. 143) It is the story of human evolution from the state of innocence, through the stage of awareness, to the condition of divine perception. The three questions "that the Many ask but only the Few can answer," "Whence comest thou hither?" "What dost thou here?" "Whither goest thou hence?" (p. 18) receive inspiring answers, and lead the sincere inquirer to the old truth about the Razor Path.

"The Path to Manhood" is a dialogue in which are set forth "the steps or conditions necessary to the attainment of spiritual individuality or 'Manhood.'" (p. 143)

The passage of the human soul from darkness to Light Divine is described in the wonderful drama, "The Vision of the Temple and the Pool." On attaining perfection, the Compassionate Wise Ones, renouncing their hard-earned peace and bliss for the sake of suffering Humanity, live in the world, though not of it, to teach aspiring souls the method of working out their own salvation.

'IF THOU WOULDST FEED THE HUNGRY,
THEN TEACH THEM TO *SOW*,
OR NO MAN REAPS WHAT ANOTHER SOWS
IN THE GARDEN OF THE KING.
IF THOU WOULDST BE PERFECT, O SERVANT
OF LIFE,
THOU MUST DWELL IN THE *LIGHT*
AND WORK IN THE *SHADOW*.

Ili Tongo Ka lase nwaye zu ze esu nka dhlineni
May thou and The United All dwell together
in Eternity.

N. K. K.

Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines, or Seven Books of Wisdom of the Great Path, according to the late LAMA KAZI DAWA-SAMDUP'S English rendering. Edited with a Commentary by W. Y. EVANS-WENTZ, M.A., D.Litt., D.Sc. Foreword by Dr. R. R. MARETT. (Oxford University Press, London. 16 *s.*)

This volume forms the third of a trilogy of very valuable works on Tibetan Buddhism that we owe to the collaboration of Dr. Evans-Wentz and the late Lama Kazi Dawa-Samdup, its predecessors being *The Tibetan Book of the Dead* and *Tibet's Great Yogi, Milarepa.*

The work consists of translations by the Lama of seven hitherto unpublished Mahayana texts with introductions and very copious notes by Dr. Evans-Wentz. The English titles of the texts comprised in it are:—

i. *The Supreme Path of Discipleship: The Precepts of the Gurus,* or *The Precious Rosary.* This collection of precepts was compiled about the middle of the 12th century A. D., by Dvagpo-Llarje, a guru of the Kargyütpa School, and one of the most illustrious disciples of the famous Milarepa.

ii. *The Nirvanic Path: The Yoga of the Great Symbol.* Of this we are told that "according to Tibetan tradition, derived from Indian sources, it is believed that the saintly Buddhist philosopher, Saraha, enunciated the teachings in or about the first century B. C.; and that already in his day they were ancient..." The teachings are said to have been transmitted orally until, in the eleventh century A. D., they came to Marpa, founder of the Kargyütpa School. "The Great Symbol," Dr. Evans-Wentz explains, "is the written guide to the method of attaining by means of *yoga* such mental concentration, or one-pointedness of mind, as brings about mystical insight into the real nature of existence." The present translation is from a Tibetan block-print epitome of the original work.

iii. *The Path of Knowledge: The Yoga of the Six Doctrines.* This work is in large measure Tantric; and it expounds the technique of *Kundalini Yoga* in its application to the generation of "psychic heat" and the acquisition of other occult powers.

iv. *The Path of Transference: The Yoga of Consciousness-Transference.* This treatise, whose nature is hinted at in its title, is, we are told, intended to be studied only under the guidance of a competent living guru, and then only after a long and severe probation.

v. *The Path of the Mystic Sacrifice: The Yoga of Subduing the Lower Self.* This treatise has come down to us through the Ningmapa School and is more or less representative of the pre-Buddhistic Bön religion. Its subject is the Chöd rite.

vi. *The Path of the Five Wisdoms: The Yoga of the Long Hūm.* This is a small work whose central theme concerns the transmuting of the Five Poisons—or Five Obscuring Passions—into Right Knowledge by means of the *yoga* of visualising and spiritualising.

vii. *The Path of the Transcendental Wisdom: The Yoga of the Voidness.* This is a translation of a short Tibetan epitome of the well-known Mahayanist work, *Prajnā-Pāramitā.*

It will be seen from this summary that the fare presented to us by Dr. Evans-Wentz and the Lama Dawa-Samdup is of varied character, including as it does the high spiritual guidance of the first treatise, the *Raja-Yoga* of the second, rules for the gaining of occult powers—some of them of doubtful value, and the very rarefied metaphysical axioms of the epitomised *Prajnā-Pāramitā.*

All the contents of the book are interesting and significant; but for the ordinary Western aspirant to the wisdom of the East the first treatise, *The Supreme Path of Discipleship,* would appear to be by far the most valuable, for many of its precepts are as applicable to laymen as to members of the *Sangha.* Many of its maxims are reminiscent of *The Voice of the Silence,* which Dr. Evans-Wentz quotes on p. 66, attributing both works to the great sages of the same Kargyütpa School. In both, the rules of the spiritual life are illustrated by vivid imagery and striking metaphor. Space does not, unfortunately, permit us to cite more than

a few scattered precepts out of whole pages worth quoting :—

To allow unto others the victory, taking unto oneself the defeat, is the sign of the superior man.

One must have confidence in the Thatness (as being the Sole Refuge) even as an exhausted crow far from land hath confidence in the mast of the ship on which it resteth.

Inasmuch as all beings are our kindly parents, it would be a cause of regret to have aversion for and thus disown or abandon any of them.

To avoid error in choosing a guru, *the disciple requireth knowledge of his own faults and virtues.*

Illness and tribulations, being teachers of piety, are not to be avoided.

That which cometh of itself, being a divine gift, is not to be avoided.

The thought of helping others, however limited one's ability to help others may be, is not to be avoided.

One must know that sorrow, being the means of convincing one of the need of the religious life, is a guru.

Unless the mind be trained to selflessness and infinite compassion, one is apt to fall into the error of seeking liberation for self alone.

A mere glimpse of Reality may be mistaken for complete realisation.

To preach religion and not to practise it is to be like a parrot saying a prayer . . .

To exercise patience for merely selfish ends rather than for doing good to others is to be like a cat exercising patience in order to kill a rat . . . .

If, after having heard much of the Doctrine, one's nature still be unattuned, one is like a physician with a chronic disease . . . .

In THE ARYAN PATH for August the writer of " Ends and Sayings " animadverted on those Western philologists who translate ancient Eastern texts while ridiculing their mystical and spiritual meanings. In Dr. Evans-Wentz, however, we have an Orientalist whose scholarship is unimpeachable and who brings to his interpretations and commentaries the sympathy of a disciple and the insight of a mystic. In his part of the work he has embodied the information given him by the late Lama Dawa-Samdup, whose English, in the translated portions of the book, is terse, idiomatic and as easy to understand as the recondite nature of much of his subject matter permits.

The printing and general get-up of *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines* are worthy of its contents, and the book is interestingly illustrated with portraits of modern Indian and Tibetan *gurus* and reproductions of a number of Tibetan religious and symbolical paintings.

R. A. V. M.

Go Home, Unicorn. By DONALD MACPHERSON (Faber and Faber, Ltd., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

This is a story of extraordinary happenings in Montreal, against a background of scientific probabilities and with an interwoven romance. The incidents which take place under dramatic circumstances comprise apparitions and materializations, such as a hand, a woman's head, and even a living unicorn; as well as precipitations of some psychic force capable of throwing a man off a theatre stage with terrific violence. Investigation by four young people gives opportunity for much speculation along scientific lines, and ultimately leads to discovery of the source of all the trouble. X-Ray experiments upon guinea-pigs have let loose vital protoplasm from these creatures; the psychic energy and invisible substance (our author uses the term "biological energy") thus created take shape and materialize under the unconscious impact of human thought and feeling. Mind is thereby shown more powerful than psychic matter. The latter, being essentially plastic, responds to the will and suggestion of individuals. Itself without self-volition or self-consciousness, it but reflects and "embodies" the moods which men and women generate—irritability, jealousy, hatred—and then it assumes evil and

destructive forms. On the other hand, a strong human will accompanied by purity, unselfishness and love can control this substance-energy and render it harmless. The writer uses the scientific axiom that matter *is* energy, and argues that when that energy is emanated simultaneously by a number of living beings (in this case guinea-pigs) its intensity and range of action are so multiplied that distance ceases to be an obstacle to the exercise of its power. Only a "mental link" provided by one or several individuals is required.

The author's speculations and their *rationale* offer much of interest to the student of occultism. Occultism recognizes what must appear utterly impossible to the rank materialist and what, in the story, requires so much paraphernalia to make plausible is happening in reality all the time. Our thoughts and feelings *are* substantial energies, creatures of the mind's begetting, which people our mental atmosphere for good or evil. Esoteric Philosophy teaches that thought is more responsible than act, and that " a given amount of energy expended on the spiritual or astral plane is productive of far greater results than the same amount expended on the physical objective plane." Evil thinkers brood mischief and sages create blessings. We hope that the spiritists will profit by this book and recognize that many of their materialized " spirits " are not their dear departed ones, but merely result from their own thoughts and désires acting upon the plastic substance emanated by the mediums and, to a lesser extent, by the sitters at the séance.

S. B.

An Early Mystic of Baghdad. A Study of the Life and Teachings of Harith B. Asad Al-Muhasibi, A. D. 781—857. By MARGARET SMITH, M. A., Ph. D. (The Sheldon Press, London. 15*s.*).

The subject of this scholarly study, al-Muhasibi, was born at Basra about A. D. 781, and lived and taught at Baghdad. Though a prolific writer, none of his works have as yet been published or edited, and Dr. Margaret Smith has based her account of his life and teaching almost entirely on unpublished MS. sources to be found in the libraries of Europe and the East. Her researches confirm the view long held by Islamic scholars that he was the real master of primitive Islamic mysticism and the precursor of al-Ghazali in giving to Sufi mysticism an assured place in orthodox Islam. As, too, some of the greatest of the Muslim mystics, both Arab and Persian, who succeeded him and who in their turn influenced the Christian scholastics, owed much to his teaching, close parallels can be traced between his mystic theology and that of Christianity. Dr. Smith neglects no opportunity of exhibiting such parallels and while the frequent comparisons she draws between al-Muhasibi's teaching and the counsels of Christian saints or directors of Souls are interesting, they tend to strengthen the impression her book as a whole leaves that we are seeing a Muslim through Christian eyes, and losing something distinctive in the process.

Certainly she quotes liberally from al-Muhasibi's writings and recorded sayings, summarises the argument of his most important works and considers in detail every aspect of his ascetic and moral theology and of his devotional teaching. Yet it is surprising that the thought of a Muslim of the eighth century can be presented in terms which correspond so closely with those employed, for example, by Von Hügel or Evelyn Underhill. And there is, for those at least who have begun to drink at the fount of a wisdom at once more ancient and more modern, a curious official deadness about many of these terms, while the morbid preoccupation with sins, mortal, venial or capital, and with nicely graded virtues which bulks so large in al-Muhasibi's moral theology, belongs to a past cycle in human development. For those, however, who can still find nourishment in a theology and a mysticism couched in these traditional

terms this book, besides being a learned study of one of the greatest theologians of Islam, defines very exhaustively the conditions of progress upon the path that leads through purification to unity. And if the new wine cannot be poured into such old bottles as this, no one could have decanted the old more carefully and capably than Dr. Smith has done here.

H. I'A. F.

We Say "No": The Plain Man's Guide to Pacifism. By H.R.L. SHEPPARD (Murray, London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

In a vulgar but vivid phrase, War might be described as The Gate crasher of Civilization. Nobody wants War, no one directly invites it, yet into almost every gathering, the shadow of Mars obtrudes itself. The Pacifist endeavour is to get rid of Mars by an absolute rejection, to annihilate him by refusing to recognize him. In Dr. Sheppard's phrase: We say No. Fundamentally it is the right attitude, the only way. Violence grows infallibly by what it feeds on. War sows dragon's teeth from which ever greater multitudes of armed men spring—as we see in the aftermath of the Great War: every country to-day armed and arming as never before 1914. Two Peace-negatives will never make a Peace-positive. The only thing to do *is* to break the vicious circle by stepping out of it altogether, preferring to damn the consequences rather than oneself be damned, believing in any case that there is no other way, that War in some sort ceases, and only ceases, with every potential soldier who steps finally and irrevocably out of the ranks.

That is Dr. Sheppard's faith. At the best he believes in the power of passive resistance to effect a change universal. At the worst he would say: Better die seeking to do good than doing evil, for no war, no mass killing, however "defensive," can be good. He discusses the tragedy, the folly, of War. He refutes the arguments of its "Christian" apologists. He rejects peace by force, even international force. He looks into the past, doubting the benefits of any war, from Marathon forward. He plays skittles with "the romance of War." He regrets Socialist militarism (opposed only to Capitalist war) as much as any. He points to the dangerous influence of vested armament interests. He asks that men should pledge themselves to "renounce War and never again, directly or indirectly, support or sanction another."

An attractive and persuasive book he makes of it all, full of honest, direct and cogent argument—a book one would have all men read. Yet how much better had it gone a little further, to take in all its implications! For in truth all Western civilization is built upon conflict, competition between nations, and between individuals within the nations. A complete Pacifism must change the whole aspect of society, for its other face is religious brotherhood, a love effective not only towards the remote "foreigner," but towards one's next-door neighbour and economic rival! Pacifism incomplete is a beating of the air; Pacifism complete is a faith which *might* sweep the world, for its essence is the essence of universal religion.

GEOFFREY WEST

CORRESPONDENCE

P. NAGA RAJA RAO ON KANT

In the June 1935 ARYAN PATH, P. Naga Raja Rao briefly compared Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* with the teachings of Sankara. So often one picks up a criticism of the *Critique* only to find that the writer has apparently entirely failed to grasp even the elements of Kant's teachings, that it was very pleasing to find a broad and understanding outline of Kant's work.

There are, however, a few apparently inaccurate interpretations, which—in view of the important relationship of Kant's work to the teachings of Theosophy—it seems desirable to point out. To prevent possible misunderstanding, I should like to state at the beginning that when I refer to Theosophy, I mean the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, chiefly published between 1877 and 1891, and that when I refer to Kant, I mean only the *Critique of Pure Reason*, first published in 1781, and slightly revised in 1787. Of the work of Sankara I can speak, unfortunately, only on the basis of what Mr. Rao himself tells us.

First, a word as to the relationship of Kant and Theosophy. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Mme. Blavatsky brought to the attention of the Occidental world an elaborate mass of teachings pertaining to the origin, destiny, and nature of man and the cosmos. She stated, and to a large extent proved, that these teachings were extremely old. She further showed that in practically all ages they had been held by certain groups, and that they lay at the foundation of practically all religions. These teachings, however, were in contradiction to the trend of scientific thought, and no means of scientific verification seemed available except through a mode of life that most were loath to follow. The age of a doctrine is, after all, no adequate proof of its validity. Beliefs and customs have a way of continuing themselves with remarkable persistency. Further corroboration was needed for a satisfactory scientific justification.

Now it happens that this further corroboration was, in fact, available, but the work in which it was embodied was little known. It was the *Critique of Pure Reason.* In this work Kant does not propound new theories, nor lay down new doctrines to be accepted or rejected according to one's personal bias. He submits definite proofs as to the nature of man and the world that reveal them to be completely harmonious with the teachings of Theosophy. Kant, in other words, is the justification of Theosophy to the intellect and science. The *Critique* does not teach Theosophy, but it removes the possibility of Scientific objection to it—more could not be expected of such a work. In this connection it is particularly significant that Kant's work appeared just 100 years before that of Blavatsky—in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, that critical period of each hundred years. It is the consideration of these facts that makes it seem worth while to point out certain misconceptions in Mr. Rao's comments.

One fundamental misunderstanding seems to be that Kant makes certain assumptions, and on these as a base builds up a possible epistemology. It is stated in the article, for example, that Kant "posits two *a priori* forms, Space and Time, as the necessary preconditions of perception," but Kant does not do this. That space and time exist in all our normal perception (and it is only with the normal that Kant is dealing) is a matter of universal experience. Kant's achievement was not the positing of anything, but the proving that space and time are *a priori* and merely formal; *a priori* in the sense that they precede or are not derived from experience, and formal in that they comprise relations only, and are not perceived as substances. To quote again:—

Kant divides reality into two parts, first the Noumenon, about which we cannot predi-

cate anything, for human reason has no applicability in that realm. Secondly, the phenomenal realm. Human knowledge is confined only to this part.

In reality the latter part of the above quotation contradicts the first part. If human knowledge is exclusively confined to the phenomenal, it cannot rightly describe the noumenon as reality, and Kant does not fall into this error. There is no element of Kant's work more often misconstrued than the noumenon.

Further quotation will show how much trouble the noumenon can cause. Sankara "posited Brahman and asserted that it was the only reality. Kant on the other hand abruptly stops with the Noumenon and fails to tell us what its purpose is." Of course he does, for to do so would be to trespass into a field in which, as Kant has carefully shown, we can have no human knowledge. Further, "he (Kant) posits the Noumenal realm to make the phenomenal world intelligible." Obviously not, for if we can have no knowledge of the noumenon, how can it make the phenomenal world intelligible? Mr. Rao also says, in speaking of Kant, "his Reason, however, is another name for intuition." This is a fundamental misconception of the first importance. I cannot understand how any student of Kant can come away with this belief.

I should like to stop here, after having called attention to the erroneous statements regarding Kant, but in view of Mr. Rao's further remark, "Sankara's epistemology when compared with Kant's is more coherent and indisputably better articulated," it seems that some further examination is required based solely on the statements in the article under discussion.

Presumably as evidence of the contrast between the teachings of Sankara and Kant, and in justification of the comparison quoted above, Mr. Rao says that Sankara "posited Brahman and asserted that it was the only reality," that to Sankara "the object of knowledge is Brahman," then that "Brahman is..... an object of spiritual experience whose existence is taken for granted on the authority of the Srutis," and finally that "the human intellect cannot grasp the nature of ultimate reality." In other words, Sankara posited Brahman, said it was an object of spiritual experience, that it was the object of knowledge, that it was the only reality, and that the human intellect cannot grasp its nature. I scarcely believe it is necessary to point out the lack of coherence or of good articulation in this set of statements. Regardless of how liberal an interpretation one is willing to place on the meaning of words, there is obviously contradiction somewhere when one thing is stated to be posited, an object of knowledge, an object of experience, taken on authority, and yet is the only reality. To show that Kant's teachings are coherent and well articulated, even though difficult to grasp, could readily be done, but it would of course require more space than is here available.

In all of this, I want to emphasize that I am not attacking the teachings of Sankara. I do not know them, and thus can justly neither attack nor praise. I can comment on them only as they are given in the article under discussion. My sole objective is to show that Kant is not properly represented, and that by belittling his work we destroy one of the greatest intellectual supports of Truth.

Millburn, PHILIP CHAPIN JONES
New Jersey (U. S. A.)

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

The well-known weekly *Les Nouvelles Litteraires* of Paris, is conducting an interesting investigation into the Spirit of Europe and its future. A questionnaire has been sent to eminent persons in the world of thought and letters and each week appears an answer from one of them. So far we have seen three of these in the issues of the 16th, 23rd and 30th November, by Paul Valéry, Romain Rolland and Julien Benda respectively. Our readers will recall a similar series which appeared in our pages during 1934, and where the question "What is Worth Saving in European Civilization?" was replied to under that very title by Jean Guéhenno and Count Carlo Sforza, and under the titles "Rise of Nationalism in Europe and the Way Out," "Menacing Barbarians of To-day," "The Soul of Europe: Its Present Plight," and "A Plea for Cultural Readjustment" by Julien Benda, Leo Chestov, J. B., and J. M. Kumarappa respectively.*

Paul Valéry believes that the European spirit "can be looked upon as a sort of myth, a myth, however, which it is useful to define." He concedes that certain traditions and tendencies are shared alike by all Europeans, and as an example he gives the *Shakespeare* "notion" which is an integral part of European culture whether in France, Italy or Germany. This "European spirit" up till recent years had shaped itself on the basis of "an invincible hope and a certain trust in the future of knowledge and in the ushering in of the absolute reign of knowledge." In reference to the rôle of the scholar he says:—

> I have no confidence whatsoever in the *direct* political action of the *hommes d'esprit*. Through it they lose their quality without acquiring the powers of the professional politicians. Politics, political action, political forms, are necessarily inferior values and inferior activities of the mind.

He believes that "thought perfectly free, completely liberated from every desire for power and every ambition for propaganda, thought as untainted and as exact as possible can *still* be made to play a part—but . . ." Analysing present-day tendencies he sees a return to division and sectarianism in thought, and fears that unless checked these tendencies will make men of Europe unintelligible to each other. If nations continue to regard themselves as independent and isolated islands the intellectual unity of Europe will be endangered.

Romain Rolland declares from the start that he does *not* and will *not* conceive of Europe in contradistinction to or in isolation from the rest of the world. For him there cannot be a spirit limited to Europe. *Europeanism* may mark a stage higher

* THE ARYAN PATH for January, May, June, August and September, 1934.

than nationalism, yet many have transcended it and will *not* go backwards.

We see too well that this *Europeanism* of the present hour, in spite of the multifarious roses with which it dresses itself up, is but a mask for a new nationalism; more dangerous still since it groups together the greatest forces and the most greedy interests, and arms them against the rest of the world. . . . Everything is moving, the whole world is in fusion. Let us not remake worlds of supernations, where the casting will cool off and reshape itself in separate *blocs*. There must be no other Internationalism than that which is Universal.

In reference to the action of scholars upon the world he states:—

I am more than anyone the earnest defender of the freedom of the mind which enables one to dominate the field of battle; yet I do not admit that to see exempts one from acting. If one sees well, one acts all the better. One must act.

Will the *new man* be European? Most certainly not, says Romain Rolland, adding: "I have seen in India and in China superior types of the *new man*."

And he concludes by explaining that the very characteristic of the new man consists in a "total elimination of the degrading prejudice of race."

Against the stupid *racialism* of the noncommissioned officer Hitler, with his narrow forehead, the new man opposes his universal humanism, without distinction of races, without distinction of class —the *Weltarbeiter*—the *worker of the world*.

For Julien Benda the whole problem is pre-eminently a moral one. He writes:—

Peace among nations will demand their adhesion to a universal principle—that of justice—which transcends their particular interests and the observance of which may sometimes hamper them. . . . Who will preach the respect of such a principle? It cannot be the state . . . The apostles of this principle can only be those who, by their very nature, are capable of rising above the selfishness of a group, that is the *hommes d'esprit*, the philosophers, the scholars.

Writers could help effectually if they declared this ethical principle and did not hesitate to denounce in their writings any nation that broke this elementary rule of morality. Those who would do this would be followed by a portion of Europe, it would be the smallest one, but "it is in the minorities that all great movements have arisen." Referring to economics, M. Benda writes:—

Of course, I shall not deny that grave economic transformations will have to be realised by Europe in the making. But I say that these transformations will only become stable on the day when they are rooted in a complete change in Europe's morality and her moral evaluations.

As an example he gives money, explaining that the concept of the value of money will have to change; and he asks, how else could this come about save "through a change in the religion of men who will then cease to believe in the almighty power of metal, and believe instead in that of moral principles?"

In the very formulation of such commandments we perceive that Europe is asked to renounce, to understand.

They are all calls to awakenings of the Soul, and not (O Marx!) to purely material actions . . . Can we say more definitely that the formation of Europe will demand the integration of new

economic realities within moral frames? And who else can create such frames if not the scholars?

In the above gleanings from the points of view of three eminent French minds we find much with which we are in hearty agreement. We too believe with Paul Valéry that it is best for scholars to avoid taking any direct part in politics. The latter do have a corrupting influence and he who enters the field of party politics sooner or later becomes tainted and loses his higher perception. We do not mean, however, that philosophers and writers should stand aloof from world movements and human affairs; no, they must not lose the common touch; but they can render the greatest service as friends and guides of the masses if they retain their integrity as free thinkers and refuse to lend their gifts to a political platform. Theirs, as Romain Rolland so nobly points out, should be the service of Humanity as a whole, not of one race, one continent, one nation, one community, or of one political party. With him we hold that the world *is* one, and that the highest consciousness of man cannot flower save in the soil of Universal Brotherhood. In this connection we may draw our readers' attention to "The World Is One" series now running in our pages and refer them to our last issue in which appeared the first article on "International Economics and Finance" by the Nobel Prize winner, the famous scientist Frederick Soddy, an authority on the subject. THE ARYAN PATH endeavours to serve the Cause of Humanity, of all Souls, irrespective of any distinction of race, caste, creed, colour, organization or political affiliation. Its Editors look upon all men and women essentially as Souls, and to them, therefore, as to Julien Benda, the crisis faced by our civilization *is* a moral one and can only be solved by a return to ethical principles and correct values. The world does not lack knowledge. In this era of specialization and physical progress we all suffer from the misuse of the very knowledge which is ours. The advancements of science are commercialised and its discoveries utilized for destructive and degrading aims. As Mr. E. M. Forster recently said in *Time and Tide*:—

> "Give us Time in our time, O Lord"—I think that's my own prayer. Give us Time to adjust ourselves to the inventions of science. Broadcasting and aviation for example—if they had taken two hundred years to develop instead of twenty, we should have had some chance of using them properly.

Our civilization is weak in moral principles. Selfishness envelops it, deluding its mind and paralyzing its heart. The only salvation lies in the acceptance and spread of true ethics, of the principles of Justice and Brotherhood. The call must be indeed one for the awakening of the Soul, and this journal through its pages reiterates the ancient note: "Arise, awake, seek the Great Ones and learn!"

WORLD

A MONTHLY REVIEW OF CURRENT AFFAIRS

Edited by

VERNON BARTLETT

World contains Vernon Bartlett's own expert interpretation of the situation of the moment, together with a cross section of world opinion and information, in the form of articles from the Press of all countries.

1s. 6d. monthly; £1 per annum

or 10s. for 6 months.

From Your Newsagents or

40/42 Chandos Street,
LONDON, W. C. 2

THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

Paper Cover, Pages 257 **Price Rs. 1-8, or 3s. or $ 1.00**

This book is a clear exposition in the form of Questions and Answers of the Ethics, Science and Philosophy of Theosophy, and is dedicated by the author "to all her pupils that they may learn and teach in their turn." This edition is a verbatim reprint of the original volume published in 1889 —avoiding thus all the errors and emendations of editions appearing after the writer's death. The importance of *The Key to Theosophy* cannot be overestimated in view of H. P. B.'s comment on it in her magazine, *Lucifer*:—

> *With the present publication of the "Key to Theosophy," a new work that explains clearly and in plain language what our Esoteric Theosophy believes in and what it disbelieves and* POSITIVELY REJECTS, *there will remain no more pretexts for flinging at our heads fantastic accusations.*

Students, therefore, will find it invaluable. The present edition is of handy size, and has been produced at the lowest possible cost so that it may be within the reach of all.

THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road,

BOMBAY

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1936

THE GREAT DELUSION
THE WORLD IS ONE: INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS AND FINANCE—*By Frederick Soddy*
THE MESSAGE OF BODHIDHARMA: FOUNDER OF ZEN BUDDHISM—*By Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki*
THE HOME AND THE STATE—*By Mary R. Beard*
LITERATURE AS A MORAL FORCE—
THE HERO IN FICTION—*By A. N. Monkhouse*
THE RETURN TO DECENCY—*By Humbert Wolfe*
THE HERESY OF SEPARATENESS—*By J. D. Beresford*
THE IDEAL SOCIAL ORDER—*By Radhakumud Mookerji*
SHAKESPEARE'S DREAM—*By John Middleton Murry*
NEW BOOKS AND OLD—
A NOBLE CALL TO ACTION—*By Hugh I'A. Fausset*
HEREDITY: SOME OLD HINDU POINTS OF VIEW—*By S. V. Viswanatha and M. A. Venkata Rao*
THE FUTILITY OF RATIONALIZING—*By Max Plowman*
REVIEWS—*By R. Naga Raja Sarma, Clifford Bax, J. S. Collis, Margaret Smith*
ENDS & SAYINGS

TO APPEAR IN MARCH AND AFTER

THE HINDU AND THE SOVIET SYSTEMS OF THE DRAMA—*By Huntly Carter*
LOVE AND DETACHMENT—*By Irwin Edman*
THE SEARCH ETERNAL—*By Paul E. Johnson*
SOLOVYEV AND PLATO—*By D. L. Murray*
THEOSOPHY OF AMMONIUS SACCAS—*By Dr. Margaret Smith*
THE UNCERTAINTY OF SCIENCE—*By J. W. N. Sullivan*
TECHNIQUE OF CARVING AT MOHENJO-DARO—*By Prof. S. V. Venkateswara*

Per Annum—Rs. 6 India; 12*s.* Europe; $3 America.
Single Copy—As. 12 India; 1*s.* 6*d.* Europe; 35 cents America.

Aryan Path Office ... 51, Esplanade Road, Bombay.
" " " ... 17, Great Cumberland Place, London, W. I.
" " " ... 119, West 57th Street, New York City.

Printed by M. N. Kulkarni at the Karnatak Printing Press, Karnatak House, Chira Bazar, Bombay 2, and published by K. N. Panday, Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., 51, Esplanade Road, Bombay.